00110835

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
Town Hall, Bombay.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 June, 2018

THE FALL OF BABYLON

FORESHADOWED

IN HER TEACHING, IN HISTORY, AND IN PROPHECY.

110835

BY

THE REV. JOHN CUMMING, D.D., F.R.S.E.,

MINISTER OF THE SCOTTISH NATIONAL CHURCH, CROWN COURT, COVENT GARDEN.

"Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues. She saith in her heart, I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."—REV. xviii. 4, 7, 8.

LONDON:

RICHARD BENTLEY, NEW BURLINGTON STREET,

Publisher in Ordinary to Her Majesty.

1870.

[*The Right of Translation is reserved.*]

sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided; but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay."—Dan. ii. 40—43.

Gibbon, as usual, indicates the fulfilment of this prophecy: "The arms of the republic, sometimes vanquished in battle, always victorious in war, advanced with rapid steps to the Euphrates, the Danube, the Rhine, and the ocean; and the images of gold, or silver, or brass, that might serve to represent the nations and their kings, were successively broken by the iron monarchy of Rome." (Vol. iii. Milman's ed., p. 634.)

Macedon was absorbed in it. Corinth perished with all its splendour before the invincible march of Rome. Egypt lost its autonomy and became a province. Judea was added to its vast possessions, and parted with its sceptre. "It trod upon the necks of emperors and kings. It made the world tributary to its greatness. It seemed the realisation of its own fabled Briareus. And, looking with its single eye—*i. e.* a lust of unbounded dominion—over the nations of the earth, it reached forth the hundred hands of its power to gratify that lust. The neighbouring state and the distant isle alike became subject to its

dominion. Britain passed under its yoke. 'These ravagers of the world,' said Galgacus, as he addressed the Caledonians, 'after all the earth has been too narrow for their ambition, have ransacked the sea also.' In other words, at the time of the Christian era, the Roman empire took in the whole south of Europe, France, England, the greatest part of the Netherlands, Switzerland, and the south of Germany, Hungary, Turkey, and Greece; not to speak of its possessions in Asia and Africa."

The victorious arms of Constantine, and increasing public corruption of morals—the inroads of the Goth and Vandal from without, and the effeminacy and sensualism universal within, at length reduced Imperial Rome to ruin; and now broken columns and temples remain the hoary memorials of ancient material splendour, but witnesses also to the fact that another unclean spirit has taken possession of the place left empty by its departed predecessor. The priest has ascended the throne of the Cæsars. Rome is now called a Christian city. It is so in a sense most peculiar. Opposite the forum there now stands a Franciscan convent. In the Coliseum a monk statedly preaches, and in the centre of its arena is erected a lofty cross, the symbol of Christianity. We hear of a Sunday the chimes of bells, and we see the outward insignia of the Christian religion in great abundance. We meet with the cross, a crucifix, or a Madonna at every turning. We wait and watch. The chief minister of the religion of the place enters the temple dedicated to worship between files of soldiers; he is dressed and perfumed and incensed, and vested

and disrobed and mitred, and lighted up in quick and changing succession. He appears to a stranger to be the Deity of the place. Can this man be the successor of Peter or Paul? Is that personage in St. Maria Maggiore, seated under a crimson canopy, carried on men's shoulders, preceded by military, and surrounded by priests and prelates dressed in gorgeous robes, and bearing lighted candles, the representative of the Christian minister described in the inspired writings of the fishermen and tent makers of Judea? Surely the rites and pomp and material show of modern Rome are not the visible features of the Church of Christ in the days of Nero or Domitian, or as pourtrayed in the writings of inspired Evangelists and Apostles. With the loudest pretensions to be the Bride of the Lamb, she exhibits in her character the most distinctive brands of "the woman" throned on seven hills, whose history is written in blood—whose ascendancy has been the decay or death of freedom, science, social purity, and national greatness—whose doom is destruction—near, terrible, and unsparing.

It is the chief aim of the author in this work, and in the expectation, he may say, the hope of the approaching destruction of the Papacy, to furnish clear and reliable evidences of her teaching and authentic instances of her practices, her dogmas, her legends, her worship, and her hostility to modern civilisation and science.

Such a work is much in request by clergy and laity.

If this system, as exemplified still further in the Bull 'Latæ Sententiæ,' and in the 'Syllabus' of

Pius IX. be the great predicted Apostasy delineated so graphically in the Apocalypse, it needs no gift of prophecy to enable one to recognise the steadily approaching doom of a system where true and false are with consummate but infernal art closely interwoven—where together meet

> "Blessings and curses, threats and promises,
> And with the terrors of futurity
> Mingled whate'er enchants and fascinates,
> Music and painting, sculpture, rhetoric,
> And dazzling light, and darkness visible,
> And architectural pomp."

Her fall is not a contingency, but an absolute certainty; and amid judgments unprecedented and terrible!

Believing her destruction is imminent, it becomes the duty of all who know the great asylum—the Divine refuge provided in the Gospels—to cry aloud to God's people in the Romish Church to "come out of her, that ye receive not of her plagues."

The writer trusts he has not used an expression —not required by allegiance to Divine truth—calculated to give offence or pain to the humblest or most sensitive adherent of the Church of Rome. But he cannot take the edge off the truth. He has tried to be faithful, and yet tender—uncompromising, and yet not uncharitable. Nevertheless, if the inspired Word of God has any weight and is true, the Roman Church is fearfully guilty; her crimes are awful, her corruption of vital truth unpardonable, and her destruction of the freedom, the rights, the liberties, the happiness, and the souls of millions of mankind

such and so great guilt, that she is not to be forgiven but punished, and utterly destroyed amid consuming retributions before heaven and earth. This is clearly revealed. Few attempt to deny it. It is after witnessing the fall of this "BABYLON THE GREAT" that the redeemed ones in heaven, in whose hearts is the very love of God, are represented singing "Alleluia! salvation, glory, and honour and power unto the Lord our God; for true and righteous are His judgments. And again they said Alleluia, and her smoke rose up for ever and ever." What the holy ones in glory rejoice at, it is surely right in us neither to bewail nor try to prevent.

Surely, nevertheless, it must be a terrible and unparalleled guilt that shuts off its authors and its victims from all compassion and sympathy in heaven or on earth. So it is. We can only add our Amen. So let it be.

"Pope, thy doom hath been for ages
Read by every eye but thine;
Flashing loud from the pages
Of a prophecy Divine;
Now the hand of Judgment writes it
On the old Mosaic wall;
And each Roman clearly reads it
On thy gates, O Quirinal."

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
The Pretensions of the Papacy	1
Babylon the Great	33
The Antichrist	62
Infallible Œcumenical Councils	95
Infallible Popes	123
Lying Wonders	131
Mariolatry	238
Immoral	278
Intolerant and Persecuting	326
Hostile to Science	365
The Quarrels of the Fathers	389
Canonical Curses	425
The Situation	438
Probable Date of her Fall	455
Babylon is Fallen	476

THE FALL OF BABYLON.

I.

THE PRETENSIONS OF THE PAPACY.

ROMANISM I must describe by epithets justly and fairly applicable. In applying these epithets I would hope that Roman Catholics will not suppose that the severity of the words one is compelled to use to Romanism is at all an exponent of one's feeling towards Romanists. Our feelings should be, and I trust are, those of affection and love for them. The erring deserve pity. Their error is their great misfortune in the estimate of men; God alone can ascend the great tribunal and pronounce judgment upon their souls. It is our privilege and our duty to pray for them, that they may be translated from darkness into glorious light, and taste that liberty and enjoy those blessed privileges which we undeservedly enjoy, but which we are neither unthankful for, nor unwilling to spread. One may be most uncompromising, yet neither in spirit nor in word uncharitable. If we see a man drinking deadly poison, but ignorant that it is so, surely the decided language in which we describe the poison neither does nor should be interpreted to intend any vituperation of him. The strongest language here employed ought to be judged by its accuracy or inaccuracy in portraying the system, and in no degree to be construed as abusive of the victims of that system.

I regard the Roman Catholic as a supernatural system. Its doctrines are seed sown by no human hand: the system is certainly unearthly, if not supernatural. It is too impure to be from above; it is too skilfully concocted to be from man. It seems to have the wisdom of the archangel, but to combine with that wisdom—and I say it with the deepest respect for the conscientious feelings of the Roman Catholic—the wickedness of the archangel fallen. I regard it in all sincerity as essentially an apostate Church, or, as it has been called, the masterpiece of the great enemy of mankind. This is not vulgar abuse, but the measured language of solemn conviction. To show that it is a well-founded estimate, I will relate a singular incident. One day I was sitting in my study preparing for the ensuing Sunday, when the servant came and said there was a very strange-looking gentleman at the door who wished particularly to see me. As I was one of the governors of the Scottish Hospital, I thought it might be a countryman who had called for a recommendation, and that the unprepossessing aspect of poverty had given the servant a bad opinion of him. I desired the servant to show him into my study. He entered clad in most uncommon attire, with no shoes to his feet, but instead leather soles, to which thongs were attached that passed between his toes and were fastened in a knot at the ankle. He wore a singular mediæval and old-fashioned cloak, with a sort of cape on his shoulders, and a broad slouching hat on his head. He bowed gracefully, and from having seen him before in a railway carriage I said: "I believe I have the honour of seeing the Hon. and Rev. Mr. Spencer?" He bowed, and said, "Father Ignatius is my name, if you please." I requested him to be seated. He sat down and apologised for calling. He said, "I have waited on Dr. Hook, on Lord John

Russell, who gave me a quarter of an hour of his valuable time, on the Bishop of London, and several others, and I have now come to pay my respects to you." I said I felt the honour he had done me, and was very happy to see him, and to converse on those subjects on which we greatly differed, but in which we both felt so great an interest, as we had each so lasting a stake. He said his great proposal was that prayer should be made all over the world for unity, first, among Protestants; secondly, among Catholics: and lastly, among all men who believed in God. This unity was the great thirst and want of the age. He then requested me to read a printed paper on the subject, and to give it all the publicity I could, and, if I approved, to act up to the spirit of it. I read it and said, "By a curious coincidence I am advertised to give a lecture in Exeter Hall next Tuesday, the subject of which is, I fear, not very agreeable to you, —'The Pope, the Man of Sin.' If you believe him to be the vicar of Christ, and I believe him to be the very opposite, how can we coalesce? How can the Pope and I walk together unless we be agreed?" He said he saw many difficulties, but he thought if we prayed and laboured for unity, we might succeed. But he let out quietly the fact, that the unity he wished for could only be obtained by everybody becoming a member of the Church of Rome, which I could not for myself pray for or desire. I said: "Let me beg of you to appear on the platform at Exeter Hall, and explain your proposition for half an hour. There will be a good audience, and they will respectfully listen. Then I will rise, and show the difficulty which I feel in accepting your proposition, and carrying it out. You shall then have a quarter of an hour to point out anything I have said which you think wrong or unjust, and to put it right; after which I will proceed with my lecture, and you shall

have the advantage, if it prove worthy, of listening to it." He said, "I am delighted with the proposal. There is only one thing in it that stands in the way—I cannot listen to your lecture." I replied, "It will do you no harm; but you can retire if you prefer it." I added that it was our custom to ask the Divine blessing on our proceedings, and that there was a beautiful collect used by the Church of England at the beginning of the Communion Service—"Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open," &c., and the Lord's Prayer,—he would, of course, have no objection to joining with us in these. He said, "Every objection. It would be inconsistent in us to join in prayer with any persons we believe to be in heresy." So there was no prospect of union here. Still, he would attend, and speak for half an hour. He said, "I came to you expecting to find a severe, rude, and repellant personage, but I find one who has spoken to me as becomes a Christian and a gentleman. I have been received with much courtesy, and I am pleased with the result of my visit." I said, "The intense zeal and devotedness of members of your Church, in which you seem to me to transcendentally outstrip many of us, make me think at times that your religion is something more than human." What was his reply? —"Sir, if the Church of Rome be not the Church of Christ, it is the masterpiece of the devil: it can be nothing between." So said Father Ignatius. So say I. There is immense significance in his words. His Church is the one or the other. One great danger to which Protestants are subject is the habit of supposing that Romanism is a coarse and vulgar imposture, unfit for the light of the nineteenth century, instead of feeling that it is a successful conspiracy of more than human wisdom, and worked out by more than human wickedness and genius and will. Antichrist, with his people, constitutes the Church of Rome: Christ, in

the midst of his, constitutes its correlative, the Church of the living God. Despise Romanism, and it will overwhelm you; tamper with it, and it will ensnare and captivate you; resist it in the name of God, with spiritual weapons, and it will flee from you. It is the masterpiece of Satan beyond dispute, and only by viewing it in that light shall we be enabled rightly to estimate our danger and its inherent capacities of progress and power.

This shows so far that in the judgment of a distinguished member of the Church of Rome it is a supernatural system, and that others than myself think if it be not the Church of God it must be the absolute antagonist of that, the master conception of the wicked one.

Romanism will be destroyed, not reformed. All past history shows that on any attempt being made to reform it from without, the reformer has been made a martyr, and that every effort from within to purify her has ended in immediate suppression. The Greek Church may be refined, purified, and conformed to Scripture; but Rome is a gigantic, infallible corporation that must sink in its totality like a millstone in the ocean, never reformed, and only those that are God's people in her, not of her, are summoned to be for ever separate that they may be for ever safe. I do not, therefore, look at any efforts we can make as likely to end in the subversion of Romanism, as a corporate body. But God has a people in the Church of Rome; many, I believe, of God's true people are in that Church, testimonies to the penetrating force of Divine truth, that has forced admission, in spite of a tremendous resistance, into the hearts of those who in due time have exhibited its practical influence. Many a monk in the mediæval ages looked beyond the crucifix which he held in his hand, and learnt to trust and glory in the Cross of Christ, and to find salvation

there. There are Roman Catholics, the least conspicuous, the least noisy, the least known, loving their Saviour and resting upon Him, whose garments only have been singed by the fires of that terrible apostasy through which they pass to the judgment-seat of God. It is because we believe that such people are in the Church of Rome that we reiterate the message, "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her plagues." Among the Roman Catholic laity there are no doubt candid and honourable men; and I am convinced that if they only knew Romanism just as it is they would bid farewell to it to-morrow, and cast in their lot with the Church of England, or some other branch of the Protestant Church.

Let us detach some of these plausible pretensions with which Romanism is overspread, and on which she depends for progress. The ancient Egyptian temples were all magnificent without, but the unclean creatures of the Nile, and the reptiles of Egypt, were the gods worshipped within. If Romanism looked what it is, men would hate it, and flee from it; but because it looks something that it is not, and pretends to be what we know it is not, it gains ground and makes way among the least thoughtful of mankind. Some are so much the slaves of the senses that, as observed by a very sarcastic writer, if you can only gain possession of their five senses you may safely calculate upon all the rest. Romanism enslaves the senses; it makes its victims in this way, and therefore it flourishes. With some men the street lamps outshine in splendour the distant stars. It is only by enlightened minds that the lamps of the streets will never be confounded with the luminaries of the sky. They who can look behind the scenes and see what Romanism truly is, denuded of its grand pretensions, will be able to see how unlike it is to

that blessed faith which has God for its author, truth for its matter, and eternal happiness for its issue.

The first boast of Romanism is its having seized and subordinated to itself the fine arts in their highest possible perfection and splendour. The Sistine Chapel and the dome of St. Peter's are radiant with the magnificent creations of Raphael and Michael Angelo. The Flemish churches have in them the masterpieces of Rubens, and the Spanish and Portuguese churches the *chefs-d'œuvre* of Murillo. Moreover, the works of these artists are essentially Romish. They lavished their splendid powers, not on Christianity but on Romanism. The gems of Raphael are Madonnas, Titian's best production is a Virgin and Child, and Guido's great work is the Madonna della Piëta. Mozart and Haydn devoted their magnificent music to Romish masses. To many this splendid outside has appeared sufficient evidence that all is pure within. If you look at its grand cathedrals, you see the very stone appearing to burst into blossom and the interior presenting proportions and symmetry so perfect that the man has no taste who does not admire. He only has no Christianity who thinks there is no salvation outside of it. But after all, if one wished to see the noblest cathedral in the world, and to worship in the grandest, I would not ask you to visit Amiens, Antwerp, or Rome, but to come to the hills trodden in younger days, where the live rock is the only pulpit, and the vast ravine the only cathedral aisle—where God's thunder celebrates His power, and His lightning writes His glory in the sky, and the song of praise rises from ten thousand voices worshipping the Lord of Hosts; and Europe's most magnificent cathedrals sink into paltriness in comparison with a sight so sublime, a spectacle so august. If I want a sacred

picture, let me have God's authentic portrait of Himself, the Bible. Let me read there the autograph of Deity. Let me take the true crucifix, the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah—that is, the Protestant crucifix—and study it instead of looking at a piece of inanimate wood. If we have no splendid images and paintings in our churches, let our lives be living likenesses of Christ Jesus. If we have no grandly decorated churches, let our bodies be temples of the Holy Ghost. If we do not use swinging censers, and incense rising to the sky, let us lift up holy hands unto God. If we are not Roman Catholics, but Catholics, let us live like Christians, and feel that there is Christianity beyond the horizon of the Church or party to which we belong.

Another pretension of the Romish Church is her perfect unity, and in this there seem force and plausibility. She points to the great central cathedral of Christendom; she proclaims it the mother of all the churches in the world. Ministering mass at its altars is a high priest who claims to be the centre of unity. She alleges that in all parts of the world, wherever the influence of that high priest extends, there is perfect unity. The fallacy lies in this: the unity of the Church, if it really exists, must not only be developed by all cotemporaneous priests and people of this day, being exactly agreed in all points of Christian theology, but by all the priests of all ages, from the first to the nineteenth century. This would be Christian unity. There must be not only unity between contemporaneous churches, but unity between all the churches of to-day, and to-morrow, and yesterday; and before the Church of Rome can prove that she has real unity, she must show that she believes precisely what the Romans believed when St. Paul wrote his Epistle to them. Unity of centuries as well as of countries, of time as of place,

is required. This last feature she is wholly destitute of.

An incident will illustrate this. I attended a meeting some time ago at Melton Mowbray. There was a very zealous priest there, called Father Belissi, who was making converts. George Finch, Esq., of Burley-on-the-Hill, and myself, were selected to give addresses. The meeting was held at twelve o'clock, and half an hour after I had begun, in walked Father Belissi. I motioned to the chairman that the priest had come, and expressed pleasure at his presence. The father leaped upon the platform with great readiness; he said he had been fasting and was not so strong as usual, and therefore begged to be allowed to address the audience from a chair. He sat down, and I did think there was in his attitude a little of the picturesque as well as a result of fasting. He stretched his two forefingers out in an inimitable and truly Roman Catholic style, and spoke with such dignity, and in such studied forms, that I really thought he wished the people of Melton Mowbray to breathe the atmosphere of the Vatican, and to fancy that it was the Pope before them laying down the law *ex cathedra*. He said he had not heard the whole of the Protestant speaker's address, nor did it matter; and therefore, instead of replying, he should go at once into the marks of the true Church. These, he said, were unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity. "If I go into a Protestant parish church," he said, "I find the clergyman reading in his surplice and preaching in a black gown; if I go into another, I find that he reads and preaches in a surplice; if I go into a third, I find the service not read but intoned. The next place I go into may be a Wesleyan chapel, and there I find a part of the Liturgy read, but I do not see any robes. The Independents have a still different form of service. I do

not know what they have in the Scotch Church; something very bad, I have no doubt, for I never was in one in my life. Now contrast all this," he continued, "with the Catholic Church. Next Sunday, at half-past eleven, at the church of Notre Dame, in Paris, at Brussels, at Rome, at Moorfields, in London, in every chapel and cathedral in the world, we shall be celebrating the same worship in the same words. Behold the glorious unity of the Catholic Church." I had to reply to a very long dissertation. I said he had proved to demonstration that Protestants had not uniformity, and that Roman Catholics had; but he had not proved that Protestants had not unity, and he had not proved that Roman Catholics had it. Uniformity is something superinduced from without; unity is a feeling that arises from a common principle within. Uniformity man can create by acting on the outer man; unity God alone can inspire, by acting on the inner heart. I did not conceive, because we Protestants differed as we did in outward forms, that we therefore indicated any want of real unity. You Roman Catholics have a great central person called the Pope, and you forego all internal differences on condition that all cling to him. We have a glorious and Divine Head, and we, too, forgive our internal differences on condition that all cling to Him. You have differences, but all are forgotten and forgiven in your admiration of the chair of St. Peter: we have differences, but all are forgotten and forgiven on consideration that we glory in the cross of Christ, and count all things but loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Him. But you differ far more than meets the eye. You have great differences. When you talk contemptuously of our Independents, and Baptists, and Wesleyans, and Episcopalians, I admit they differ in ritual, in external and ecclesiastical *régime*,

in matters circumstantial, and of relative but not vital importance. But have you not your Franciscans, and Passionists, and Dominicans, and Jesuits, and Redemptionists, and Flagellants, and black friars, and grey friars, and white friars? If we have great differences, most certainly yours are not little. And with all the differences that Protestants of various denominations develop, they constitute what looks more, on the whole, like the church of St. Peter and St. Paul in the first century than does that motley group—the component materials of which I have described to you; and I am persuaded that if all Churchmen and Dissenters were ranged on one side, and all these Romish orders or denominations on the other, and the Apostle Peter were standing between them, hearing both claiming to be his children, he would say, "Independents, and Baptists, and Episcopalians, I know; but," turning to our Romish friends, he would say, "Pray, gentlemen, who are you?" Uniformity does not seem to me to be the law of nature. Suppose some proprietor, bitten with a sort of Romish botanical taste, in possession of a fine forest, should take it in his head that every tree, which as a daring heretic grows according to its own liking, should be cut each of them into the shape of a perfect pyramid. He carries out his design in December, and then calls me to see the splendid sylvan uniformity and unity he has produced. I visit it, wonder, and retire. Next June I pay him a second visit, but on looking at the forest, I find every tree, notwithstanding the severe discipline of December, has burst out "at its own sweet will," and that the only trees that remain just as he left them are the dead ones. Precisely so is it in the Romish Church. The Pope trims them to his system by force, and as long as they are dead they remain so; but let one pulse of the

life of God go into the heart of the meanest among them, and there is a Luther or a Ridley. It is not God's law that there shall be uniformity; it is his law that there shall be unity. I said the difference between Romanism and Protestantism, supposing both to be nearly right, is this: you in the Church of Rome have unison, we Protestants have harmony. In unison one note is sounded by every voice; B flat, or A three sharps, or other tone or semitone. The Pope strikes the key-note—say B two flats—and every priest throughout Christendom takes up and repeats the same sound. It is not so with us. Our key-note is sounded from the skies, and is taken up on earth; by the Church of England, the grand bass; by the Church of Scotland, the tenor; by the Methodists, the contralto; by the Independents, the soprano: thus each takes his own part, and all parts combined constitute the harmony heard among the choirs of heaven. The day is come when we may unite on such a field and for such a cause as this without the compromise of things more or less dear to each. I would, for the sake of grand results, concede the largest husk of prejudice, but I am not prepared to concede the least vital seed of living truth. The time is come when the members of every Church who hold firmly the glorious truths we have in common, should be prepared to more or less give up those prejudices and feelings which have kept us apart, by the merging of which, at such a crisis, we may the better uphold the institutions of our fatherland, and hand down those blessings which we prize unimpaired to our children, and become blessings to the victims of error, and so accomplish more substantial results than any we have yet achieved.

There was an island in ancient times called Delos. In it no warrior might set his foot; in its light no soldier might be seen. It was sacred to the peace of

the nations of the earth. Our Protestantism should be our Delos. Internal quarrels should there all cease, and we should stand knit together as one phalanx, opposing with united strength those who would subvert our peace, or sweep away or dilute the principles upon which that peace depends.

No doubt, if to fascinate the eye with exquisite paintings; if to charm the ear with the music of the most illustrious composers; if to provide for the smell the ascending incense,—if these be the main ends of a Church, the Church of Rome has attained those ends in an eminent degree. But if the true end and scope of religion is to raise men to the likeness of God, to bring the creature into fellowship with the Creator, and to make the lost partakers of the Divine nature, and to enable men "to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with their God," and hereafter to reap the rewards of grace,—then I submit that the Romish Church, instead of these great and sublime ends, is fitted to accomplish the very opposite. She has fallen into apostasy in doctrine, and immorality in practice. A true description of the gorgeous splendour of the Romish Church is a very painful, but a very plain one. The Italian bandits construct beautiful palaces out of the robbery of orphans and the plunder of widows. The syren's music charmed the unwary traveller to his destruction. The music of the Romish Church is that of the syren's, that lures to ruin; her architectural beauty is that of the Italian bandits' hall, constructed out of spoils. Her whole structure presents a moral *fac simile* of the Egyptian temples of old, in which was the most imposing architecture without, while the gods within were the filthy creatures of the Nile, and the vegetable products of its mud.

There is something in the simple Gospel so majestic, so transcending all that the pencil of the painter or

pen of the poet can embody, that Christianity seems adorned the most when it is adorned the least. Would one think of sprinkling a few drops from a phial of otto of roses, in order to add to the perfume of the rose just gathered on a May morning, and wet with the dews of heaven? Were that splendid monument of genius, the Apollo Belvidere, to be placed in the British Museum, should we applaud the taste of the man who would propose that the mercers' and the hatters' and the shoemakers' shops should furnish ornaments with which to adorn it? There is something in the almost living lineaments so noble; something in the contour and proportions of the marble so fine, that the richest clothing of man would deform, not dignify; dim, not reveal it. The Gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ is so beautiful in itself, that all accessions of material beauty serve to conceal or mar it. The Rose of Sharon is so fragrant, and its tints so lovely, that it needs no sprinkling from the streams of the Isis, still less from the filthy waters of the Tiber, either to augment its perfume or to heighten its colours.

The rage for adding outward and material ornament to the Gospel of Jesus is founded on a fact, confirmed and illustrated by almost universal experience in the history of the Church, that when the spiritual glory of a Church begins to depart, she proceeds to heap up and attach to herself material and worldly ornaments. When the beauty of "mercy and truth meeting together, righteousness and peace kissing each other," fades from her altars, the painter, and the poet, and the musician are summoned to her aid, to create a substitute for the lost and departed glory. The true explanation of Romish ornaments piled upon ritual, faith, and worship, is, that having ceased to draw their beauty from above, having forgotten that "the King's daughter is glorious *within*,"

not *without*, they feel constrained to ransack Aaron's wardrobe and the heathen flamen's vestry, in order to collect ornaments to be substituted for that beautiful worship, the inscription on the length and breadth of which is, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

It is also pleaded on behalf of the Church of Rome, by her patrons and priests, that there are many good men in her communion. Unquestionably there are; and it would indeed argue that Satan had lapsed into a blunder, instead of pursuing successfully the subtle tactics by which he has always been characterised, if he were to put forward Popery merely by bad instruments, or to promote the principles of semi-Popery by men of questionable or blasted reputation. Satan always selects, where he can, the choicest instruments to accomplish his iniquitous designs. In the Church of Rome there has been a Fénélon, signalised by the moral goodness that inspired his temper and irradiated his walk—there has been a Martin Boos, distinguished even for the faithfulness with which he preached the everlasting Gospel in the midst of Rome; nor can I omit Pascal, a Jansenist it is true, but still a Romanist, whose writings may be perused with profit by the most spiritually-minded Protestant. But these men were Christians, not in *consequence* of their creed, but in *spite* of their creed; and in the ratio of their Christian faithfulness they were persecuted; they are only standing proofs that there is a penetrating energy in the truths of the Gospel, which the overshadowing despotism of Rome has not been able entirely to exclude, and which the proscription of its Councils has not succeeded in utterly extirpating. There is not a height on the loftiest Apennine on which there is not some blossom which the winter frosts have not

nipped—some floweret which the hurricane has not blasted. There is no desert without an oasis. And so there is not a Church or a communion under heaven in the bosom of which there are not here and there some witnesses that God has not utterly forsaken it; thereby presenting the very ground on which Protestants can address hundreds in the Romish Church in the language of the Apocalypse: "Come out of her, *my people*, that ye be not partakers of her sin, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

It has been alleged that there are *many truths* in the Roman Catholic system. Doubtless there are. There are truths in Deism, throughout all its shades; there are some truths even in Mahometanism; and it would be strange indeed if there were not here and there and often unextinguished truths in the vast mass of doctrinal corruption by which the Church of Rome is at this moment oppressed. But these truths, I allege, are inoperative, if not wholly subverted as to their practical effects, by the overflowing corruptions of heresy and error. Were a tumbler of water placed in my hand, and were I to let fall into it only six drops of pure unadulterated prussic acid, and to request one to drink the water, would he not reply, "No, I object to do so; it is poison?" Suppose I were to answer, "There are ninety-eight parts of pure fountain water, and only two parts prussic acid," would he not naturally say, "Yes, but the deleterious effects of the acid are so intense, that the wholesome properties of the water are thereby utterly neutralised?" So it is in the Church of Rome. Were it proved that there are (as there are not), ninety-eight parts pure and primitive Christianity in the Romish faith, the additional parts coming from man's corrupt heart, and concocted in man's depraved imagination, are so dele-

terious, so deadly, that it makes void and valueless to man the everlasting Gospel.

The Roman Catholic Church maintains with great plausibility that she is *the ancient Church*, and that we Protestants form an upstart and modern sect. If by this statement it is meant that the essential principles of Popery are ancient, I do not for one moment dispute it. In its principles it is coeval with the fall of man; indeed, I believe with Luther that every man is born with a pope in his heart. Popery, in fact, is a plant indigenous to human nature; it luxuriates in the congenial soil of the corrupt heart; it demands no fostering, no paternal and nourishing care; it will bloom, and flourish, and spread, if just let alone. But truth is an exotic in this world; it is a native of a lovelier, even a celestial clime; it needs to be daily watered by heaven's pure dews; it requires to be touched by the rays of heaven's holy Sun; and it is only with the tending cares of a mother, and the watchfulness of a nurse, strengthened and sustained by the Holy Spirit, that Christianity is kept alive and growing in the heart of a lapsed and God-estranged world.

Popery, I have said, is coeval in its principles with the Fall. By way of illustrating this, I will state what may appear, at first, in the light of a paradox, but will yet be found to be a great truth,—it is this: Adam was a Papist before he became a Protestant. I do not say that Adam was designed to be a type of a Romish priest. He was an instance simply of man fallen and man restored; and just in so far as Romanism is *a* provision for the sinner, but not *the* provision, it was shadowed forth in Adam. When he fled from the presence of God and wrapped himself in fig-tree leaves, either to conceal the nakedness he then first felt, or to constitute a robe that would be a title to the consciously lost favour of God; when he

ran from the face of Heaven, and sought shelter amid the yet undismantled bowers of Paradise; the man, in all this, presented the perfect type of the Roman Catholic Church. Her safety, she feels and fancies, lies in sheltering herself from the searching eye of God; her favourite raiment is the "filthy rags" of human righteousness; and much of her glory, such as it is, is the merit of her canonized saints. She seems to believe her security very much depends on the secrecy with which she can conceal herself from that God who pronounces the most exalted human righteousness to be sin, all human wisdom folly, and human life itself, in its best estate, to be vanity. But when after Adam's flight the glorious Gospel sounded amid the ruins of Paradise, and Adam's heart thrilled with the soul-inspiring accents, "The seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head;" when again he turned his face toward that very God from whom he had fled, and approached him with bended knee and broken heart, and called him "Father," our great progenitor, in that act, presented the bright type of the Protestant Church.

In the very next generation we see the antiquity of Romish principles in practical development. Cain was, *in principle*, the first Roman Catholic priest; and Abel, *in principle*, was the first Protestant minister and martyr. This will be seen, if we only bear in mind the definition of the sacrifice of the Mass in the Church of Rome, that it is an "unbloody sacrifice" (that is, a sacrifice without shedding of blood), and with this, the definition of our great Sacrifice in the Protestant Church, that "without shedding of blood there is no remission of sins." When Cain was about to offer his sacrifice to God, he obviously pursued some such course as this: he selected the loveliest flowers that bloomed in his garden, he gathered the most delicious fruit that grew upon its

trees, but faintly blighted by the Fall; he brought that fruit and those flowers together, as of the products of an unfallen world, wove them into an amaranthine garland, laid it on the altar of his God, and knelt and said, "O Lord! I devote these flowers and fruits to thee; thy smiles gave them all their beauty, thy breath gave them all their fragrance; I acknowledge thee, in this act, to be my Creator and my providing and protecting God." There he stopped. But when Abel was about to offer his sacrifice, his course as well as convictions were not the same. He selected a meek and a spotless lamb from the fold; he plunged the knife into its throat, and shed its blood; and having laid it on the altar, he thus prayed by the enveloping flame and ascending smoke: "O Lord my God! with my brother Cain I acknowledge that thou art my Creator; with my brother Cain I acknowledge that thou art my Preserver, and that earth and all therein were made by thee; but beyond him, and what he has fatally lost sight of, I acknowledge, O my God, that I am guilty; that as this lamb dies, so ought I to die; and that my faith and hope gather all their nutriment, and all my salvation from 'the Lamb slain before the foundation of the world;' 'the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world.'" The contrast shows that Cain's was the unbloody sacrifice, exactly typical of the Mass; and that Abel's was the sacrifice accompanied with bloodshedding, as exactly typical of that sacrifice which was made once for all upon the Cross on Calvary. Romish principles, we must therefore admit, are not wholly novelties; they date their birth at the entrance of sin.

If by the statement urged by the Church of Rome, that that Church is the ancient Church, and prior to ours, she means that *her* principles, and not *ours*, were taught by the Apostles, then the very fair and

reasonable appeal which I make to every Roman Catholic is just this. Take the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans (which Roman Catholics are aware was addressed to their Church, while yet in her purity and unstained glory), and compare with the principles laid down in that Epistle the Canons of the Council of Trent, or the Creed of Pope Pius IV.; and if you can show me that the principles held by your Church at the present day are coincident throughout, or in the main, with the principles preached by the Apostle Paul in his address to the ancient Roman Church, I will cease to be a Protestant and become a Roman Catholic. Or, to bring the matter to a still more practical issue, listen to the preaching of your priests for one single year, and then, after you have done so, listen to the preaching of a minister of the Protestant Church; get a short-hand writer, if you can, to report their respective discourses for you, and compare the preaching of the Protestant minister and the preaching of your priest with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans; and if you discover that your priest preaches justification by faith only, without the works of the law; redemption only through an atonement once offered by the Saviour, not to be reiterated; and being justified "by faith, peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ," then remain where you are and charge Protestants with most unwarrantable schism in leaving a Church so pure, with principles so apostolic: but if you find that the very reverse is the case—that the preaching in the one pulpit dovetails with the statements of Paul; and that if the preaching of your priest be true, Paul's must be heresy; and if Paul's be true, your priest's must be false; if you find that the preaching of your priest is the opposite of the preaching of St. Paul, then I implore you by the mercies of God—I implore you by the prospect

of a judgment day—I implore you as you shall answer for the statements that are here laid before you—I implore you by all that is sweet in the Christian privileges of time, and all that is awful in the prospects of immortality, to leave a Church where the Saviour is practically *subordinate*, and hasten, "like doves to their windows," to join a communion where "Christ is all, and in all."

If by the statement that the Romish Church is the ancient Church, and ours the modern, it is meant to be conveyed that the Church is always visible, and that during the fourteen centuries that preceded the Reformation the only visible Church was the Romish Church, and the only communion also that pretended or professed, by her numbers, her aspect and appearance, to be the true Church; then I at once maintain that it is not necessary to the definition of a Scriptural Church, that it should be always, and at all times, visible. There was a Church when Elijah stood alone, and all his compeers were hiding from persecution; there was a Church (according to the statements of some distinguished advocates of the Romish communion), and but one single individual in that Church, when our Lord was crucified, that Church being comprehended, as they say, in the Virgin Mary, and in her alone.

But if it be asked, Where was the visible Protestant Church prior to the Reformation by Martin Luther? I can tell them, to their shame, for it is too easy to do so. The valleys of Piedmont and the Cottian Alps still cry aloud, amid the mementos of the tears and blood by which they were stained, "The persecuted representatives of the true Church were hid, by thousands, *here*." The dungeons of the Inquisition, and the prison of St. Angelo, if they could find a tongue, and become vocal with honesty and truth, would tell a kindred tale; and the inscrip-

tions on the walls of the Inquisition at Rome very memorably declare, "The persecuted children of the Church were murdered and starved *here*." Persecution trod down the true Church. The visible Protestant Church was in the grasp of the Romish Church; and was not created, but only emancipated and unlocked from that grasp at the era of the Reformation.

Lord Lindsay states that on visiting the Pyramids of Egypt he found in one of those ancient repositories of the dead, a mummy, which indicated, according to the mode of interpreting hieroglyphics adopted by Champollion and by Young, that it was full two thousand years old. On opening the case, and unrolling the mummy, he found in its right hand a bulbous or rather tuberous root. Lord Lindsay wondered whether vegetable life could outlast an imprisonment of two thousand years; and in order to put the problem to the test, he opened the hand of the mummy, took out the vegetable root, planted it in a fertile and favourable soil, and exposed it to the sunshine and the dews of heaven; and to his amazement and delight, that lately dry root shot up, and presented a stem, unfolding a most beautiful flower. The Protestant Church, before the Reformation, was in a position similar to that of this root; it was compressed in the iron grasp of the most deadly despotism. All that our Reformers did was to unlock the hand that held it; to take out the concealed epitome of heaven's high principles; to plant it in the father-lands of Germany, of England, of Scotland, of Ireland; and to place it beneath the beams of the Sun of Righteousness, and the raindrops of the Spirit of God, till it took root, and grew up, and presented, as it does now, wide-spreading boughs crowned with many blossoms.

The Romanist asserts and proceeds on the suppo-

sition that at the Reformation we founded a new Church. This we deny; we merely brought out the old Church. The pearl of inestimable price was overlaid and concealed by accumulated rubbish, and all we did was to remove the rubbish and disclose the pearl in its inherent beauty. When Hezekiah purified the rites of the ancient Church, and our Lord expelled the money-changers from the Temple in his days, the one only restored that which was corrupted, while the other purified that which was defiled. Our Reformers detached what was "of the earth, earthy," and retained what was of heaven, heavenly. A broker in Paris one day purchased a picture, which seemed to be a painting of the Virgin Mary by some very inferior and inartistic hand, for a few francs. While he was examining it, a little bit of the exterior paint happened to break off, and, to his amazement, he saw something beneath that indicated the touches of a master pencil. He resolved, at the risk of the cost of his purchase, to remove the whole superficies which constituted the representation of the Virgin Mary; and on doing so, he found, to his astonishment and delight, that there was beneath it an exquisite picture of our Lord, by a great master. Our Reformers found Christ's body, which is the Church, covered with representations of the saints, and of the Virgin Mary, and of the priesthood; and all that Luther did was to scale off fragments of the outward covering in order that its hidden beauty might peer forth. Ridley and Cranmer scaled off a further part of it; and Knox, though it is true he rubbed very roughly on the original, took off all the remains and vestiges of the corrupt and earthly crust that called itself Christ's Church, and thus proved the Reformation Church to be merely a new edition of the Apostolic Church. Alas! after these have been detached, a miserable

and misguided section, in the age in which we live, is busily occupied in collecting all the scattered fragments of the old layers, and labouring to glue and paste them on again in order to bring back the apostasy, under the pretext of restoring apostolic practices, and to cover and conceal every Protestant truth by laying over each a correspondent Popish corruption.

If the Church of Rome persist in maintaining, upon the one hand, that *she* is the ancient Church, and we, on the other hand, that *we* are the primitive and the truly ancient Church, we ask of the Church of Rome, Who is to decide which is true? If I propose the Holy Scripture as the arbiter, the Church of Rome exhausts her vocabulary of abuse in order to denounce the word of God. If I propose contemporaneous churches—the Greek Church, the Syriac Church, the Coptic Church—the Roman Catholic advocate tells me that these were and are schismatics. If I propose the most illustrious divines that Protestant Christendom has produced, the answer of the Romish advocate is, that they are heretics, and cannot be listened to. If I propose a General Council to decide the question, Which is the ancient and which is the modern Church? the Roman Catholic will say, "A General Council by all means, if you please, but the Pope must be at the head of it; and if it should decide anything contrary to his mind, it must immediately be dissolved, and its decree necessarily go for nothing." Then who is to determine the truth? "We are the ancient Church," says Rome, "just because we assert it; and we will shelter ourselves in the restored castle of infallibility, and maintain that we are right and all the world are wrong, in spite of revelation, in spite of divines and doctors," and we may add, "in spite of common sense itself."

"But tell us," says the Roman Catholic advocate,

where and when the errors began by which you say we are deformed, and then we will believe that they are subsequent corruptions, and therefore novelties." Now this, we reply, is trying to merge the *character* of the doctrines in the *chronology* of the doctrines. The question is not *when* the doctrine began, but the question is, whether it is denounced as error, or declared as truth, in the oracles of God. If a taint were found in the River Thames, and were two persons to go to London Bridge, and find this taint or colouring matter there, and if one were to maintain that it was part and parcel of the original water of the river, and the other were to insist that it had been introduced subsequently in its course, what would be the best way of determining the question? Surely it would be, to proceed to the fountain out of which the Thames flows, and if what is called the taint be there, it is part and parcel of the river; if it be not there, then, wherever and whenever it began, it is no part or constituent element of the stream. So it is with those errors that are disastrously distinctive of the Church of Rome; the true plan is, not to trace upward their rise, and spread, and development through darkening ages, and confused centuries, and generations of heretics, and obscure folios, but to come to and examine the sacred fountain, which the Church of Rome must profess to be primary and original. If transubstantiation be distinctly taught *there*, it is of God; if it be *not* taught there—it matters not when it began—it is not of God, and is not, therefore, Christian truth.

The fact is, the Protestant Church is alone the primitive and ancient representative of the truths of God. I rise up to revere that Protestant Church, as having on her brow the signature of the maturity of age, radiant with the vigour and vitality of youth. And all that we seek to do is, to detach from that

Church the gaudy embroidery and cumbrous ornaments wherewith Rome has not adorned, but deformed her, and to let her look forth in her primeval and unshorn glory, "fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," enclosing in her heart the love and life of her God, and bearing upon her brow the superscription and the likeness of her Lord, irradiated by that light which was kindled at the cross, and is destined to be merged only in the more brilliant glories of the crown.

The Church of Rome claims *sanctity* or *holiness* as her distinctive mark. If I were to ask a Protestant what he means by sanctity, he would instantly reply, "The work of the Spirit of God upon a man's heart, melting his will into God's will, and making his wishes run parallel with the precepts and commandments of His holy laws.'' But if I ask a Roman Catholic, he tells me that his Church has always understood this attribute to mean her possessing beatified and canonized saints. Hence, the Romish defender, in order to show that the Church of Rome has sanctity, does not prove that her principles and practice are coincident with those inculcated in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, or with the fruits of the Spirit as enumerated in the fifth chapter of that to the Galatians; but he shows that the Church of Rome has given birth to a Dominick, who, with rosary and torch, helped to forward the Inquisition; to a Santa Rosa, or Theresa, illustrious for innumerable wretched and self-righteous austerities; to an Aquinas, the eloquent author of persecuting dogmas; and to a Bonaventure, infamously renowned for his idolatrous Psalter. But in order to give some instances of what she counts sanctity, let us read one or two extracts from the Breviary. The Missal in the Church of Rome answers in ecclesiastical use exactly to the Prayer Book of the Church

of England; but the Breviary is a book *sui generis*, exclusively for the clergy, a certain portion of which must be read every day by every priest of the Church of Rome, and if he fail to do so, he is in mortal sin, and cannot say Mass. Hence, on the Continent, we see priests reading this book in the *diligence*, or on the railway; and in this country, when it draws near to twelve o'clock at night, they will step aside from the amusements in which they have been pleased to join, and hasten into a corner to peruse the requisite quantity of the contents of the Breviary, that they may thereby escape mortal sin, and be able to say Mass the next day. Now, an extract or two from this book will show the sort of sanctity possessed by the Church of Rome. Holiness,—"doing justly, and loving mercy, and walking humbly with God,"—are with these men, old-fashioned, exploded, Protestant doctrine; but wearing hair-cloth belts and girdles, fasting, and doing penance, are proofs of sanctity that none but a Church with a true succession can manifest.

I read from the Roman Breviary, the Antwerp edition. I begin with page 591:—St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi: "She tortured her body with hair-cloth, whippings, cold, hunger, watchings, nakedness, and all kinds of punishments." Again, St. Anthony, Bishop and Confessor, page 572: "He lay down to rest upon the ground, on the naked boards, and always wearing hair-cloth, and sometimes girded with an iron chain next to his skin; he always completely preserved his purity." The Sumner Portion, page 398,—St. Juliana: "She was wont to bruise her body with scourges, knotted little ropes, iron girdles, watchings, and sleeping on the naked ground; she partook very sparingly of food, and that a vile sort, four days of the week; on the other two she was content with only angels' food; the Sunday was ex-

empted, on which she was nourished on bread and water only." St. Jerome Emilian, page 483: "In a mountain having discovered a cave, he hid himself in it, where, beating himself with whips, and passing whole days fasting, prayer being protracted far into the night, and enjoying a short sleep upon the naked rock, he paid the penalties of his own faults and those of others." St. Ignatius the Confessor, page 508: "He passed a year subduing his flesh by a rough chain and hair-cloth, lying on the ground, and bloodying himself with iron whips." St. Cajetan the Confessor: "He sometimes afflicted his body by beatings whole nights, and he never would be persuaded to relax the asperity of his life, witnessing that he desired to die in ashes and sackcloth." St. Francis Borgia, page 416, the Autumnal Portion: "In that pursuit of a stricter mode of life, Francis reduced his body to a state of extreme thinness by fastings, by iron chains, by a very rough hair-cloth, by bloody and long beatings, and by very short sleep." St. Theresa, page 345: "She burned with so anxious a desire of chastising her body, that although the diseases with which she was afflicted might have dissuaded her from it, she often tortured her body with hair-cloth, chains, handfuls of nettles, and other very sharp scourges, and sometimes she would roll among the thorns, being accustomed thus to address God: 'O Lord, be it my lot to suffer or to die!'" These are the children of the Church of Rome; these the proofs that she has sanctity.

The Church of Rome claims *Apostolicity;* or her assertion is that she maintains in all their purity the doctrine and discipline of the Apostolic or primitive Church.

Instead of entering minutely into the merits of this pretension, let me submit the following contrast. The Apostolic Church said,—"We break one bread;"

the Romish Church says,—We break no bread at all, for the communion element ceases to be bread, and becomes flesh and blood. The Apostolic Church said,—"Bodily exercise profiteth little;" the Church of Rome says,—It profiteth much, for in the sacrament of penance it leads to the forgiveness of sin. The Apostolic Church said,—"Scripture is profitable for all;" the Romish Church says,—It is not profitable to the laity: the fourth rule of the Index of the Council of Trent containing these words, that "inasmuch as greater evil than good results from the indiscriminate perusal of the Scriptures," the laity are forbidden to have them, except with the *written* permission of the bishop or inquisitor. Again, the Apostolic Church said,—"Prove all things;" the Romish Church says,—Prove nothing, but believe everything. The Apostolic Church said,—"A bishop must be the husband of one wife;" the Romish Church says,—He must be the husband of no wife at all. The Apostolic Church said,—"Marriage is honourable in all;" the Romish Church says,—Marriage is not honourable in priests. The Apostolic Church said,—"The wages of sin is death;" the Romish Church says (as every Roman Catholic will find in the well-known Catechism called the Abridgment of Christian doctrine)—"Venial sin is a light offence, such as the stealing of an apple or a pin, which does not break charity between man and man, much less between man and God." The illustration here derived from the stealing of an apple, one cannot help remarking, is a most unfortunate one, for it was stealing an apple that—

> "Brought death into the world, and all our woe:"

but let this pass. The Apostolic Church said,—"There is one sacrifice, once for all, for the sins of all that believe;" the Romish Church says, There

are many sacrifices, and many priests, always trying and never able to take away sin. Now, with this contrast, which every one possessed of a Bible and the Canons or Catechisms of the Council of Trent, may verify, is there, I ask, or *can* there be any foundation for the pretension that the Romish Church is apostolical? Her apostolicity seems like *lucus a non lucendo:* that is, she calls herself apostolic because she is not so. The Spirit of God gives her her true and appropriate name; she is the Apostatic Church.

The Roman Catholic Church declares that within her bosom, and her bosom alone, is there *certainty*, for every one who embraces her principles and subscribes her creed. The argument of Romish priests is, "In the Protestant Church all is uncertainty, every one is at sea; one believes one thing and another believes another, and none can be sure that he is right; but if you enter the Roman Catholic Church, you come into the region of sunshine, and into possession of a certainty which can neither mislead nor ever be shaken."

Of all Churches under heaven, the Roman Catholic has the least of the element of certainty in her construction. There is a Canon of the Council of Trent which every Roman Catholic priest knows, and which every Roman Catholic layman ought to know, in which it is declared, that if the priest "should not *intend* to do what the Church intends," in the administration of any of the seven sacraments, there is no sacrament. There are seven sacraments in the Church of Rome; among which are matrimony, penance, holy orders, confirmation, extreme unction, baptism, and the eucharist. Now I know, from no questionable source, that many of the priests in Ireland, and not a few on the continent of Europe, are infidels secretly at heart, and priests only in

profession. To give one clear proof, the Rev. Mr. Nolan, who having abjured the Roman Catholic faith, became a clergyman of the Church of England, has stated that for twelve months before he left the Church of Rome, he did not believe in the doctrine of transubstantiation; and adds, in his pamphlet, which has never been replied to, that he knew numbers of priests in Ireland who did not believe in many of the peculiar dogmas of the Romish faith. In all these cases, according to the law of the Church of Rome, in which the priest happened to be an infidel at heart, or where he did not believe in the sacrament about which he was conversant, nor hope nor intend to effectuate what the Church does and defines, there was no sacrament at all, and thousands of Irish Romanists have perished because they were unbaptized and without a sacrifice. If a priest does not believe in transubstantiation, he may consecrate the wafer, but there is no transubstantiation, because his *intention* is wanting; and the consequence is, that in such a case every Roman Catholic must adore what, on his own principles, is only flour and water, and trust for atonement to a sacrifice which is no sacrifice at all. On Protestant principles, a man knows whether he be married in the sight of God or not; on Roman Catholic principles, no Roman Catholic husband can be sure that he is a married man. If the priest who solemnized that sacrament was an infidel, it was no sacrament at all; it was a mockery. Not only so; but if the bishop who ordained that priest was an infidel, Orders being a sacrament, it was no ordination; if the bishop who consecrated that bishop was an unbeliever, or uncanonical, or simoniacal, he was no bishop at all; and, in fact, a Roman Catholic must be able to trace the succession of his bishops and priests, and, what is less easy, to scrutinize the

thoughts of their hearts, up to the days of Gregory the Great, and beyond these, before he can be sure that he is not living in sin, or that he and his wife are lawfully married in the sight of God, or that he has ever received a single sacrament. Such is certainly the Church of Rome in one particular only.

The Great Apostasy claims *Catholicity.* The Church of Rome contends that she is the Universal or the Catholic Church.

No system ever spread so widely and fearfully through the length and breadth of the world as the Roman Catholic system, not excepting Christianity itself. This dread despotism has made her name to be revered and heard as the name of destiny. She has struck her superscription upon the literature, the poetry, the painting, of every page of the history of Europe; she has laid her hand upon the altar and the throne, upon coronets and crowns; and the marks of bloodshed alone which she has left in her wake, testify that she has spread her power from the wilds of the Arabs to the steppes of the Cossack. I still affirm that there never was a period in the history of Europe when the Roman Catholic Church could truly say that she was strictly and literally Catholic; that is, that every human being in Europe, much less in the world, was a Roman Catholic. She it is who contends for literality in the interpretation of every epithet; we take her own principle to guide our construction, and we assert that she never was, as she never will be, Catholic. Multitudes belong to her:—"The whole world wondered after the Beast." "She sitteth on many waters,—or, multitudes and tongues and nations." But her greatest spread is only the clearest sign, to heaven and earth, of her identity with the Apostasy, and therefore of the certainty and nearness of her fall.

II.

BABYLON THE GREAT.

THAT this is not a literal, but a figurative name, is proved by the descriptive word, "Mystery." Bellarmine accepts Rome as the antitype of Babylon, but regards it as its Pagan name. Bossuet is of the same opinion.

Ancient Babylon had become a ruin when John wrote the Apocalypse. His description is therefore inapplicable to it. He describes this Babylon as seated on seven hills—as a city which in his time reigned over the "Kings of the earth." It is therefore Rome under a new phase, putting forth spiritual, not imperial prerogatives, no longer tolerant, as was Pagan Rome, of all religions, but supremely intolerant of any religion but her own; with the brand "Mystery, Babylon the Great," on her brow, and the cup full of intoxicating and subtle ingredients—mysteries, miracles, indulgences, idolatries, absolutions—of which the nations long drank, and slept the sleep of death. But we shall best grasp the whole portrait and most successfully fix its identity by quoting at length the graphic words of the inspired seer of Patmos: "So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness, and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy, having seven heads and ten horns. And the

woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication; and upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth. And I saw the woman drunken with the blood of the saints, and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus; and when I saw her I wondered with great admiration." "And the woman which thou sawest is that great city, which reigneth over the kings of the earth." "And after these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lighted with his glory. And he cried mightily with a strong voice, saying, Babylon the Great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird. For all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her fornication, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth have waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies. And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." On this awful apostasy the judgment is pronounced: "The merchants of the earth shall weep and mourn over her, for no man buyeth their merchandise any more: the merchandise of gold, and silver, and precious stones, and of pearls, and fine linen, and purple, and silk, and scarlet, and all thyine wood, and all manner vessels of ivory, and all manner vessels of most precious wood, and of brass, and iron, and marble, and cinnamon, and odours, and ointments, and frankincense, and wine, and oil, and fine flour, and wheat, and beasts, and sheep, and horses, and chariots, and slaves, and souls of men." (Rev. xvii.

and xviii.) This is a truly dreadful description; it is a painful but inevitable duty to attach it to an existing communion on earth. The argument ought to be clear and cogent to warrant our fixing its application on any communion. If it be clearly applicable to Rome, any charge of severity and uncharitableness does not fall on us. "I speak as unto reasonable men; judge ye what I say." I demand of my readers patient and thoughtful attention, and I entreat them to despise the sorry ribaldry of a few who have confidence in caricature, in flimsy witticisms, and personal invective, and studiously ignore sober evidence, fair discussion, and the testimony of the word of God.

Nearly all leading divines of the great Reformation have regarded Babylon, here delineated, as the symbol of the Church of Rome, and expressed their almost unanimous conviction that the identity of the symbol with the antitype is so clear and so complete that it is not capable of any other consistent elucidation. The judicious Hooker, who spoke so warily, because he thought so justly, said, "What Romanists call schism we know to be our reasonable service unto God, and we obey the voice which crieth, 'Go out of Babylon, my people, that ye partake not of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues.'" I do not dare to think or to say that because the Church of Rome is Babylon there are no Christians in it. There were Jews in ancient Babylon—Shadrach, Meshech, and Abednego, and Daniel—*in* it, but not *of* it; captives in the midst of it, while their unstrung harps were hung upon the willows, and they longed earnestly and passionately for freedom and restoration to Jerusalem. So in the heart of the convents, and chapels, and cathedrals, and monasteries, and errors of Rome there are found true Christians whose minds have caught gleams of the celestial sunshine that pene-

trates portions of the surrounding darkness, and have had their hearts touched with a Divine and irresistible influence, and are *in* that Church, but not *of* it, to whom we also would address what Richard Hooker applied to the Romanists of his day,—"Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues."

Prior to the Council of Trent a person might preach the Gospel in the Church of Rome, though it abounded in corruptions, because these were not then consolidated into an irresistible and tyrannical yoke. The Council of Trent, confirmed by Pope Pius IV., made the Church thenceforth an entire and hopeless apostasy. Romish priests are, in virtue of their office, in no sense Christian ministers. In the *Pontificale Romanum*, in which is the ceremonial of the ordination of a Roman Catholic priest, the priest is not ordained to preach the Gospel at all. This is not his mission. A cup and a paten are placed in his hands, and he is ordained to consecrate and offer up Christ Jesus, soul and divinity, body and blood, a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead; and the man who is ordained to this office is in virtue of this ordination no more a Christian minister than a Mahometan mufti, or a believer in the creed of Confucius.

Of course the Church of Rome denies that this portrait belongs to her, and one does not wonder, but this is no proof that it does not describe her. The Jew denies that the prophecies of the Old Testament, relating to his own dispersion, and his rejection of the Messiah, apply to him, but they nevertheless do apply to him. The Church of Rome protests that the prophecies in the Apocalypse do not describe her. She is nevertheless the original. The facts to be submitted will indicate the points of contact that

identify the portrait in the Apocalypse with that Church with a force that shall be clear to all when an angel shall cry from the open heaven, "Babylon the Great is fallen, is fallen, and is no more at all." Dr. Wordsworth, Bishop of Lincoln, one of the ablest Protestant controversialists of the day, makes the remark, "It cannot be doubted that the most eminent divines held and taught that the Apocalyptic prophecy concerning Babylon was meant by the Holy Spirit to describe the Church of Rome." This is the judgment of a calm, judicial mind, and entitled to the very greatest deference.

Is the city here described in the Apocalypse Rome? Secondly, is it that city in its spiritual, or in its temporal and pagan character? Literal Babylon it cannot be, for the Babylonish Empire was destroyed 600 years before the date of the Apocalypse. Again, the word "mystery," which means a truth shrouded beneath some figure—something that is not apparent on the surface—is a part of the inscription upon its brow. "The mystery of iniquity" is the language employed by St. Paul in his description of the apostasy the seeds of which were sown in his day. Were it literal Babylon, it would be no mystery; nor would this application be consistent with actual history. The city, too, described in the Apocalypse existed, and was dominant, in the days of John, the author of the Apocalypse, for he says, "That great city which *reigneth*," the present tense. It was a city which existed in the days in which John wrote; and the only city then existing that could be regarded as dominant, or "reigning over the kings and nations of the earth," was the city of Rome. It could not be said of Babylon in ruins, or Constantinople, that either was then "reigning over the kings and nations of the earth;" it would be contrary to fact, and transparently so. The predicted destruction of this

city is to be with awful and overwhelming events, which it cannot be said have yet occurred. This city, therefore, still exists. We are told, again, that "the seven heads are seven mountains, on which the woman sitteth." This is the Spirit's own interpretation. Rome, it is notorious to everybody, was built upon seven mountains: their names are, the Palatine, the Quirinal, the Aventine, the Cælian, the Viminal, the Esquiline, and the Capitoline. We find in ancient poets, historians, and orators frequent allusions to this geographical situation, so frequent and so pointed, that we are warranted in calling Rome the seven-hilled city. Plutarch calls Rome *την Ρωμην επταλοφον*. *Urbs septicollis* is an expression of frequent occurrence in Latin writers. Horace writes, *Dis quibus septem placuere colles.* Tibullus writes, *Carpite nunc tauri de septem montibus herbas.* A coin of Vespasian represents Rome as seated upon seven hills, and Romulus and Remus, suckled by a wolf, at her feet. These expressions are common in writers immediately subsequent to the age of St. John. An early attempt was made by those who wished to get rid of this evidence of identity to show that Constantinople, or New Rome, as it was called, was built upon seven hills. But could it be said that Constantinople reigned, in the days of John, over the kings of the earth? Was Constantinople numismatically, historically, or poetically pronounced to be the seven-hilled city? Would any one acquainted with ancient writers think of applying the epithet *septicollis urbs* to any other place than Rome? The apostle, however, conclusively shows what he means when he writes, "It is that great city which *reigneth*." This he could not have said of Constantinople. The name applied to Rome, as the recognised mistress of nations, and reigning over the whole earth, is familiar to most readers. *Maxima rerum Roma. Domina*

rerum. Coins are still extant with the inscriptions *Dea Roma, Roma Eterna,* &c. There is no doubt that Rome is the fourth empire of Daniel. When John wrote the Apocalypse, Ephesus, to which he addressed an Epistle, was a province of Rome; so also was Palestine; "The sceptre had departed from Judah;" and Rome, in the days of John, beyond all dispute, and beyond the reach of all evasion, was that great city that then reigned over the kings of the earth.

This city, identified with the woman subsequently described, has the expression "Mystery" for her peculiar feature. It has been shown by Dr. Wordsworth that geographically there is a parallelism between ancient and modern Babylon, and that spiritually, or mystically, the parallel is complete. Geographically, Babylon was intersected by the Euphrates; Rome, by the Tiber; Babylon was surrounded by vast pools; Rome, by its Campagna; Babylon boasted of her eternity, her glory, her indefectibility: "I sit as a lady, and am no widow;" Rome transfers almost the same language to herself; Babylon had the vessels of the sanctuary in the midst of her; Rome carried off the golden candlestick and the sacred vessels of the ancient sanctuary of God; and the still existing triumphal arch of Titus proves the fact. The destruction of Babylon of old was the restoration of the Jews, and almost every Jew will tell you that the moment Rome, which he calls modern Babylon, is destroyed, his long expectant race will be converted, and march in national procession, with a cloud of glory over them, the pillar of cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night, to worship Him whom they crucified on the banks of the Jordan. Kimchi says, *Cum devastabitur Roma erit redemptio Israeli*:—"When Rome shall be laid waste, Israel shall be redeemed." Augustine calls Rome

Western Babylon. Every one acquainted with the Jewish controversy knows that one grand obstruction to the conversion of the Jews at this moment is the idolatry of the Church of Rome. I use the word idolatry with a thorough appreciation of the magnitude of the charge when brought against any communion. The Jew tells you that if Romanism be Christianity, it cannot be consistent with Judaism; because one of those laws impressed upon the heart of the race, and unerased by the surge and the sweep of eighteen centuries, is, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, or any likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth; thou shalt not bow down thyself to them nor worship them;" and as long as the Jew holds by that commandment, he never can accept the Roman Catholic religion, or worship in the Roman sanctuary, or regard the glories of Mary, or the Psalter of St. Bonaventure, as less than blasphemy and idolatry.

Was this interpretation, so clearly just, accepted by ancient Christian writers? Suppose it were not, it would be no disproof. Were all the Fathers to say that the Church of Rome is the Bride of Christ, and were a single Scripture reader to assert that she is the Apostasy, that Scripture reader would be right, because he believes God, and all the Fathers would be wrong. The concurrent testimony of all the Fathers of Christendom does not weigh one feather against the testimony of a single Apostle. But after all that is said of patristic authority we of the nineteenth century are the true fathers. The Fathers were the youths of the Church of Christ. We have the same Bible that they had; we are just as near, for all practical purposes, to the Apostles' days, as was Chrysostom or Jerome, who lived three centuries after them; we have the promise of the same Holy

Spirit to lead us into all truth; and we have all the advantages of criticism, historical research, excavations, travels, discoveries, and other elements of Biblical investigation, which place us in a more favourable position in 1870 for the interpretation of the Scriptures than the Fathers were in the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era. But here I am dealing especially with the Roman Catholics, who are under a solemn vow not to interpret the Scriptures otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. Let me warn them they will find a very unanimous consent that Rome was Babylon; it is not difficult to produce from their own most illustrious divines the clearest proof that by cardinals, saints, and doctors, Rome was held to be the Babylon of the Apocalypse. Why, it may be asked, did not the apostle say he meant Rome at once? The reason is obvious: if he had said so, a whole torrent of proscriptive and sanguinary persecution would have burst upon the heads of the poor and scattered Christian flocks; he therefore gave as much light as would enable us to-day to know the application, and he involved it in as much mystery as would shield the early Church from the proscriptions and persecutions of her adversaries. If prophecy were so plain that there could be no possibility of misapprehension, all responsibility would be taken away; if it were so dark that we could not interpret it, it would be no longer "a light in a dark place." It has darkness enough to make man responsible, and call upon him to inquire, and it has light enough to lead him who reads and prays to a clear and solid understanding. Chrysostom writes—

Τι δηποτ' ουν εστι το κατεχον αποκαλυφθηναι αυτον, τουτ' εστι, το κωλυον; οἱ μεν του πνευματος την χαριν φασιν, οἱ δε την Ρω-

"What, then, is that which restrains from Antichrist being revealed? Some say it is the grace of the Holy Spirit, but

μαικην αρχην, οἰς εγωγε μαλιστα τιθεμαι [p. 612, vol. xi. Paris, 1838]. others believe it to be the Roman Empire, and with them I most agree."

Papias, a scholar of St. John, quoted by Eusebius (ii. 15), says, "Babylon, from which Peter dates his first epistle, was Rome." In a discussion at Hammersmith, my opponent said, "There is no doubt Peter was at Rome, for he dates his Epistle there." I asked him to open his Bible and read me the passage. He did so, and read, "The Church which is at Babylon saluteth you." I said, "Then you accept Babylon as the name of your Church?" "Certainly I do," he replied. "Then," I answered, "you must accept the picture of your Church in the seventeenth and eighteenth chapters of the Apocalypse;" to which he listened patiently, but not very much pleased. Irenæus says, "Because the Latins and the Romans are they who now reign, the woman which thou sawest is that great city which reigneth over the kings of the earth." (B. V., c. 30, p. 448, Grabb.) Tertullian writes, "Names are used by us as signs. Samaria is the sign of idolatry; Egypt, of maledictions; and in the writings of St. John Babylon is a figure of the Roman city." Jerome says, "When I dwelt in Babylon, and dwelt within the walls of the scarlet adulteress, and had the freedom of Rome." This is a Father, after whose interpretation the Romanist must interpret the Scriptures. If I have said hard things about the Romish Church, let it not be forgotten that St. Jerome, a Father, has said much harder and severer things. Again he says, "The Roman city is specially called Babylon." (Hieron in Esai, c. 24, vol. iii., p. 209, Paris, 1706.) Augustine calls her, *Alteram in occidente Babyloniam*:—"The other Babylon in the west." (De Civitat. Dei, xvi., c. 17, and xviii., c. 2, 22, 27, p. 687, vol. vii. Paris, 1838.) Again, *Et ipsa Roma quasi secunda Baby-*

lonia est (Ibid., p. 775): "Rome is as a second Babylon."

We have seen first from heathen writers, that "the city which reigneth," and which is throned upon seven hills, is Rome; we have next found the same interpretation in patristic writers. Let us now come down further in the history of the Church. In proportion as the great Apostasy became more developed, and the points of identity between Rome and her corruption and Babylon of old became more apparent, of course Roman Catholics, some of whom recognised it, were more cautious in expressing themselves; but still there never was wanting a witness in the darkest ages to testify against Rome as Babylon, and to denounce her corruptions as deadly and soul-destroying superstitions. I will appeal to writers whose value Roman Catholics will at once admit. The Rhemists (those Romish writers who wrote notes on the New Testament) state that the Babylon of the Apocalypse was Rome. Bellarmine, the ablest and the subtlest Cardinal who ever championed the Church of Rome, says, "John in the Apocalypse calls Rome Babylon, for no other city besides Rome reigned in his age over the kings of the earth, and it is well known that Rome was seated on seven hills." Than this I know not a fuller and more candid admission. Baronius, the celebrated Roman Catholic historian, says, "It is confessed that Rome was signified in the Apocalypse by the name of Babylon." (Anno 45, n 18.) And Bossuet, the Eagle of Meaux, says, "*C'est une tradition de tous les pères que le Babylon de l'Apocalypse, c'est l'ancienne Rome:*"—"It is a tradition of all the Fathers that the Babylon of the Apocalypse is ancient Rome." How, then, do they escape the consequences? I answer, They allege it is Pagan and not Christian Rome,—or what we call ante-Christian Rome. But one very remarkable personage (quoted

by Dr. Wordsworth), Olivi, a Franciscan monk of the thirteenth century, writes, in his Postils on the Apocalypse—

"Per hanc sedem Bestiæ designatur carnalis clerus in hoc quinto tempore regnans et toti ecclesiæ præsidens; unde et putavi quod tam Antichristus mysticus quam proprius erit pseudo Papa, caput pseudo prophetarum. Hæc mulier stat hic pro Romana gente et imperio, tam prout fuit quondam in statu paganismi quam prout postmodum in fide Christi. Multis tamen criminibus hoc mundo fornicata; vocatur ergo meretrix magna."

"By this seat of the Beast is designated a carnal clergyman reigning in this fifth age, and presiding over the whole Church; whence, indeed, I have thought that the mystical and peculiar Antichrist will be a false Pope, the head of the false prophets. The woman here stands for the Roman nation and Empire alike in its former state of Paganism and its subsequent profession of Christianity, &c.

If the judgment of Bellarmine, and Bossuet, and Baronius be correct, that the Babylon of the Apocalypse is Pagan, and not subsequent Antichristian Rome, then the following strange result ensues,—that in a prophetic history of the Church of Christ, giving its rise, its progress, and its final triumph, the Church of Rome is not once mentioned. It would seem strange that so important a corporation as the Church of Rome, presided over by an infallible Pontiff, with its gigantic progress, and its peculiar and distinctive dogmas, should not be alluded to. It seems also strange, if Pagan Rome be intended, that the history of the future Church should terminate about four hundred years after the Apocalypse was written, and that for fourteen hundred years more it not only exists, but nothing is said about its existence at all. It seems still more strange, that on the fall of Pagan Rome it should be alleged that this dispensation was positively to close while it still remains; and equally strange that there should be such warning against the worship of Jupiter and

Juno, and the gross idolatry of the Pagan gods, and no warning against the more seductive idolatry of the Church of Rome. But suppose, now, that a system was to arise, Christian in name, but doing violence to the truths of Christianity—a system of specious and portentous pretensions, fitted to captivate the senses, covering its cruelty with pious names, perverting the Gospel, and persecuting the faithful, it would seem strange, if this system be Romanism, as we can prove it to be, that there should be no allusion to it whatever from the commencement of the Apocalypse to its close. If the woman be heathen Rome, and not Antichristian Rome, where were the ten kingdoms prior to the fall of the Roman empire? Daniel shows that ten kingdoms were to evolve from the wreck of Rome. If the woman be Papal Rome, we have the ten kingdoms, and we have these, as they are stated to be in prophecy, the allies of the Beast, shining in its lustre—Bavaria, Austria, Savoy, France, Spain, Portugal, Naples, Rome; or, as they have been otherwise stated, Italy, Germany, France, Switzerland, Hungary, Belgium, Spain, Portugal, Britain. These, it is said in the Apocalypse, were to give their power to the Beast, which Beast could not be Pagan Rome, as no ten kingdoms then existed. If, then, the allusion be to Papal Rome, the prediction is fulfilled; if not, it is contradicted by facts. But let us notice the records of the destruction of Babylon, and we shall see the consequence of any other interpretation. What was to take place on the destruction of the city?

It is said that Babylon "is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils, and the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." Now Bossuet and Bellarmine assert that this Babylon was Pagan Rome. They also admit what history attests, that Pagan Rome is fallen. But what was to

succeed its fall? The place of it was to become "the hold of every foul spirit, and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird." If, therefore, as Roman Catholics assert, Pagan Rome is referred to under the name of Babylon, they must admit that their Church which has succeeded is the hold of every foul spirit, and every unclean beast and bird; but if, on the other hand, Babylon be Roman Catholic Rome, they must admit that she is the "mystery of iniquity," "Babylon the Great," "the mother of abominations." They may accept either horn of the dilemma. If Pagan Rome be the choice of the Roman Catholic, let him stand by it, and admit that his Church is the hold of every unclean bird and beast; but if Christian Rome, as he calls it, he must admit she is Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of the abominations of the earth. It is alleged that Babylon was to be "utterly burned with fire;" and the smoke of her burning was to ascend to heaven for ever and ever. But Pagan Rome was not utterly burned with fire; the smoke of her torment and her ruin does not ascend to heaven at the present moment. Instead of all her jewels and all her splendour being covered with smoke, and calcined in the flames that consumed her, we have Roman pontiffs and cardinals still clad in gorgeous robes; we have processions, cavalcades, embroideries on her altars, jewels in her mitres, and incense, not smoke, ascending from her censers. We have no evidence that she has been utterly burned with fire, but there is the strongest evidence that this doom awaits her—that Babylon, the mystery of iniquity, the great Apostasy, is exposed to this terrible prediction.

But we have other positive proof, of a moral kind, that Babylon is the Roman Catholic Church. Christ describes his relationship to a people by the beau-

tiful imagery of marriage. "I have espoused you as a chaste virgin to Christ." "Husbands, love your wives, as Christ loved the Church." And in the Apocalypse, reference is made to the true Church as the bride getting ready to meet the bridegroom. Now, a harlot Church is one that has been unfaithful, that has fallen from her vows, and forgotten and trodden under foot the very first and purest allegiance that she owed. Bossuet's objection—and the Roman Catholics have laboured most powerfully to escape the charge that I am attempting to substantiate—is that such a Church ought to be called an adulteress and not a harlot. But it is not what she ought to be called, but what God actually calls her. Are we warranted by other passages of Scripture in using this figure to denote a fallen and idolatrous Church? I answer, We are. In Isaiah i. 21, we read, "How is the faithful city" (that is, Jerusalem,) "become a harlot:" the very word used in the Apocalypse. Hosea iv. 15, "Though thou, Israel, play the harlot." So in Ezekiel xvi. 16, Jeremiah ii. 20, and Micah i. 7.

Bossuet contends, again, that a faithless Church ought to be called Samaria, which is a part and parcel of the holy territory, and not Babylon, which is utterly a heathen land. He reasons in some such a manner as Ritualists do; they say they are the Church, and the Scotch Church is Samaria, as almost but not altogether within the sunshine of the true Church; but the Dissenters they hand over, according to their beautiful and charitable theology, to the "uncovenanted mercies of God." Bossuet argues that a false Church ought to be called Samaria, and that it is inconsistent with the use of figures to call her by the name of a heathen country, such as Babylon. In Ezekiel xvi. 48, Jerusalem is called "the sister of Sodom." Isaiah addresses the ancient

Church by heathen names when he calls them "rulers of Sodom" and "people of Gomorrah." (i. 10.) In the address to the seven Churches a false teacher is called by the heathen name Jezebel, and this great city is called in the Apocalypse "spiritually Sodom and Egypt, where our Lord was crucified." Vitringa commenting on this, says—

"Roma dicitur Babylonia causa idolatriæ; dicitur Egyptus ob tyrannidem in populum Dei; dicitur Sodoma causa corruptionis morum; et spirituale dicitur Hierosolyma quippe in qua Dominus mystice dici queat crucifixus esse."

"Rome is called Babylon for her idolatry; Egypt, for her tyranny towards the people of God; Sodom, for the corruption of her morals; and, spiritually, Jerusalem, because it may be said that the Lord, mystically, was crucified there."

Thus I conceive the arguments of Baronius, Bossuet, and Bellarmine are completely disposed of.

A further proof that Babylon, and the woman, which is the synonyme for it, is a false Church, is the contrast that runs through the Book of Revelation. In the Gospel of John ὁ αμνος is the original for the Lamb, but in the Apocalypse it is το αρνιον. Why is the neuter gender adopted in the latter case? Because in all probability it answers as a contrast to το θηριον, the wild beast; ἡ πορνη και το θηριον, the false woman and the wild beast, form a perfect contrast to ἡ νυμφη και το Αρνιον, the Bride and the Lamb. The contrast is most complete:—

Rev. xvii. 1–3.

"And there came one of the seven angels which had the seven vials, and talked with me, saying unto me, Come hither, I will show unto thee the judgment of the great whore that sitteth upon many waters. . . . So he carried me away in the spirit into the wilderness; and I saw a woman sit upon a scarlet coloured beast, full of names of blasphemy,

Rev. xxi. 9.

"And there came unto me one of the seven angels which had the seven vials full of the seven last plagues, and talked with me, saying, Come hither, I will show thee the bride, the Lamb's wife. And he carried me away in the spirit to a great high mountain, and showed me that great city, the holy Jerusalem, descending out of heaven from God, having

having seven heads and ten horns; and the woman was arrayed in purple and scarlet colour, and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls, having a golden cup in her hand, full of abominations and filthiness of her fornication. And upon her forehead was a name written, Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of harlots and abominations of the earth."

the glory of God; and her light was like unto a stone most precious, even like a jasper stone, clear as crystal."

Let us mark the contrast. First, there is a woman arrayed in material splendour, enthroned on nations, and on her forehead the inscription, "Mystery," and then, in opposition to this, a woman clothed with the sun, ready to give birth to a man-child, and the dragon watching to devour him. In the first you have the woman throned on seven hills, persecuting, seated on "the beast," which is the power of the red dragon; and contrasted with this, a woman driven into the wilderness, persecuted by the red dragon. In the apostate Church we have a woman arrayed in scarlet, jewels, pearls, and gold, and precious stones,—Babylon the Great; in the other, a poor, persecuted woman emerging from the depths of the wilderness after much tribulation, but clothed in fine linen, pure and white, which is the righteousness of saints. In the apostate Church we read of one burned utterly with fire, her smoke arising for ever and ever; and in the other we meet with the millennial bride ready for the bridegroom; we see the glorious procession coming down from the skies, and hear the grand anthem rising from the earth, "Alleluia, for the Lord God Omnipotent reigneth!"

Thus are the two Churches contrasted. The false Church is arrayed in scarlet, decked with precious gems, possessed of much gold; the true Church has washed her robes, and made them white in the blood

of the Lamb; her gold is tried in the fire: her precious stones are shining graces, labours of love, pious disinterestedness, holy zeal, more beautiful than flowers, more resplendent than stars, more precious than pearls from the caves of the ocean, or richest gems gathered from the mines of the earth. Moral glory is real glory, and material glory is false glory. There is a touching picture in the Gospel. Our Lord was seated with his twelve apostles round him. What did those imperfectly instructed apostles say? "Behold what manner of stones are these;" pointing to the grand component materials of the Temple of Jerusalem. But what was Christ looking at all the while? At a woman casting her mite, which was all that she had, into the treasury of the Church. They were admiring with a carnal eye a material temple; he was gazing with his holy eye upon a living temple. They thought, "How majestic are these great stones!" He thought, "How precious is this living stone!" The Church of Rome sees no beauty except where there is meretricious splendour; the true Church sees real beauty where there are the graces of the Holy Spirit. "The King's daughter is all glorious *within*." The history of the two Churches is clear. Down one or the other must go. We must flourish on the wreck of Babylon, or Babylon must flourish on the ruins of Jerusalem. See the history of the one: Popes arrayed in Oriental magnificence, adorned with barbaric pearl, and gold, and precious stones; kicking crowns from the heads of emperors; borne by kings in sedan chairs; the highest prince at the Pope's dinner carrying in the first dish to show honour to this successor of the fisherman Peter; cardinals arrayed in scarlet and purple, intriguing in cabinets, snatching at the reins of empires, surrounded with embroidery, and tapestry, and golden vessels, and saying, "We sit as a queen;" or, to quote a well-known pastoral, "We

govern, and shall continue to govern." If the angels, ignorant of this creation, were to ask, "Who are these and whence come they?" the answer must be, "These are they who have reigned as kings upon the seven hills, whose adherents are multitudes, whose glory is material, whose doom is destruction, whose name is Mystery, Babylon the Great, the mother of the abominations of the earth."

I turn to the opposite page, and ask, What is the true Church? I see some emerging from the depths of poverty and want, from sick beds and sorrows, from the dungeons of the Inquisition, and from the dust and ashes of the martyrs' fires; coming from battle-fields, where they have fallen; or from the sands of the desert, their only winding-sheet; or from the depths of the ocean, where their requiem has been long sung by the wild sea waves. Among them I see Augustine, Vigilantius, Paul, Alcuin, Agobard, Claude of Turin, Peter of Bruys, and Henry of Lausanne; the Paulicians in the East, from their beds of martyrdom, and the Waldenses in the West, from the valleys of Piedmont, their candle relighted, never to be extinguished till it mingle with the splendours of the millennial day. I hear Jura bid them welcome from its lofty heights; the Apennines open their grand portals, and the Alps lift up their everlasting gates, and the valleys of Piedmont give up their dead, for whose sorrows, and tortures, and agonies Babylon alone is responsible. I see Martin Luther, and Melancthon, and Calvin, and Latimer, and Ridley, and Knox, who never feared the face of clay, come forth from their shrouds, and appearing round the judgment-seat. And when the angel from heaven shall ask, "Who are these, and whence come they?" the answer will be, "Lo, these are they who came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb,

and therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve him day and night." Such are the two contrasts.

But we proceed still further to identify Babylon with the Church of Rome. It is said that she had a golden cup filled with the intoxications with which she had intoxicated the kings of the earth. It is a most remarkable fact—as if history were striking out the fulfilment of prophecy—that Leo XII., in 1825, on the occasion of the last jubilee, had a medal struck, on the one side of which was himself, and on the obverse a woman holding forth a golden cup with this inscription, *Sedet super universum;* translated into Apocalyptic language, "She sits upon many waters." Do you ask what is her intoxicating wine? What are her indulgences? What are her relics, her absolutions, her wonders and signs, her vast pretensions, her infallibility, indefectibility? What is her great splendour, her grand music, but the intoxicating elements by which wavering Protestants are made drunk, and thereby become slaves to the great Babylonian Enchantress?

It is said that she was "drunken with the blood of the saints." This is an awful characteristic, on which I do not dwell at length here. What land, from the sacred heights of Calvary to the pinnacles of the Alps, has not been drenched with the blood of martyrs who have been slain by her? The Inquisition is an awful history compressed into a single word. It is related from official documents by Llorente, that from the origin of the Inquisition in 1478, to the Reformation in 1517, 13,000 persons were burned for heresy. The fourth Lateran Council, in 1215, ordered the secular arm to obey the spiritual in punishing heretics. There was the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, from which France has never recovered, for she drove her best people to other lands—at least such as had escaped

death; and she has scarcely had a day's peace since. There is a God in history. Let nations sin, and nations will suffer. France has only to read her own past history to see the secret of that volcano on which she now sits, threatening to explode again, and devastate wide Europe with its awful forces. At a signal given from a church I have visited in Paris, St. Germain de l'Auxerrois, every Roman Catholic fell upon his fellow Protestant citizen, and stabbed him to the heart, those only who were warned in time escaping from the ruthless murderers; and when tidings of the event were brought to Rome—if this Church be so mild and so tolerant, as certain of her rulers describe it,—if it be so gentle and so forbearing, as certain dependents and champions in the House of Commons declare it,—the Pope must then have received the tidings of the thousands of innocent men, women, and children butchered by his subjects with horror and sorrow. If the Lord of glory had heard in Jerusalem that thousands in Samaria had been slain by the Jews, he that wept over Jerusalem would not have restrained his tears at hearing of so sad and terrible a tragedy. But how did his vaunted successor receive the tidings? A well-known medal is the answer to that question. It is struck from a die in the Vatican. The die was ordered to be made the moment the Pope received the tidings of the massacre. On one side is the figure of an angel, with a cross in his left hand and a sword in his right, with numbers of men and women struck down and prostrate on the earth before him; over it is written, "*Strages Huguenotorum:*"—"the slaughter of the Huguenots." On the opposite side are the words, "*Gregorius XIII., Pontifex Maximus.*" That gigantic murder was regarded as a meritorious act. Pius V. pronounced a Bull against Queen Elizabeth, dethroning her; and how does the present Pope regard his impertinent

namesake? I refer to the Breviary and the Missal for an answer. Every priest must by twelve o'clock read his Breviary; and if he does not, he will not be fit to say Mass on to-morrow, and so he will fall into mortal sin. Refer to the 5th of May, and you will find Pius V. is described as having "performed the office of Inquisitor with inviolable fortitude of mind." And in the Missal it is stated that "he crushed the enemies of the Church." This Pius V., thus commemorated in a devotional collect in the Missal and the Breviary, is avowedly taken by Pius IX. as his model.

Again, in the Canon Law, which is now set up by the Pope in England, it is said, "If the temporal ruler, being required and admonished by the Church to purge his territory of heretics, shall have refused, let him be hung up with the chain of excommunication" (that does not mean to be hung by the neck). "And if he shall not have satisfied, let his vassals or his subjects be released from their allegiance to him: that heretics being exterminated, the Catholics may possess the country, without any molestation, for the future."

These proofs are all I will here adduce for the purpose of identification. The Church of Rome is "drunk with the blood of saints," and she has not abjured her principles or repented of her past. If she will come forward and say, "The law of the fourth Lateran is wrong, the bull *Unigenitus* is wrong, and the Canon Law ought to be cast into the Thames, or burned in the public streets," we will accept her repentance, and thank God that the "unchangeable Church" has changed, parted from her infallibility, and acknowledged herself to be, like us, fallible and liable to err. But she has not done so, she will not do so; she remains unchanged, and unchangeable, Babylon to the last, till she perish

beneath the judgment of that God who has alike enunciated her crimes and predicted her doom. We may rest assured that the Church of Rome only wants power to develop these principles. Her principles are the same. I give her credit for inveterate unchangeableness in evil. I do not say there are not good Roman Catholics among the laity who have a horror of these principles; I do not say that there are not laymen in the Church of Rome who abominate these dogmas. I speak of the great body of the bishops and priests who must know these things, and that all the charges I have made are words of truth and soberness.

But when the Church of Rome cannot persecute, we are told, in the language of the Apocalypse, that she intoxicates and commits sin with the kings and princes and nations of the earth. How has she done this? She cajoles and threatens by turns. She has two plans—exact counterparts of the Babylonian despot. She says, "If the sounds of the sackbut and psaltery, and of all sweet music, will prevail on you to bow down and worship the golden image that I have set up, then well; but if these will not charm you to do it, then the furnace heated sevenfold shall compel you." The Church of Rome has her gentle entreaties, her enchanting strains, her captivating appearance, and when these fail she has Dominus Dens arranging his fires, the Canon Law in every diocese of England preparing its devotees to exterminate heretics when able, that the Roman Catholics may have England all to themselves. Rome has tried to win our rulers by flattery, and she has failed. In the language of Hooker, "She has fawned on kings and princes by her spiritual cozenage, and made merchandise of them." She gives them Agnus Deis, and holy beads, and empty titles in exchange for power. She has tried, in her

dealing with our country, a new process. For many years her policy was to get England quietly and peacefully to accept her drugs, her presents, and flattering promises. She failed in the gentler process, at least to a great extent; and she now proclaims the terrible one she has prepared for us. She has tried to get the great Samson—if I may use the expression as a type of our native land—to lay his head upon that Delilah's lap, that she may shear him of his locks, and his strength, and his beauty, and his glory, while he sleeps securely; but she has failed to deceive him. His hair has grown again. He is yet strong and unsubdued. Let Rome beware; he will rise in his reinvigorated strength, and, more blessed than the ancient prototype, involve Rome, not himself, in the ruins of her empire.

But I hasten to another feature. She is described as sitting upon a scarlet coloured wild beast, covered with precious stones and gems. In all the processions and cavalcades of the Pope in the *Ceremoniale*, we cannot but notice what a large space the colour of red and scarlet occupies. The Papal habit is said to be adorned with precious stones, "*rubeum pretiosum, et mitram ornatam gemmis*," &c. In the procession to the Lateran there are strange officers, namely, the barbers and shoemakers of the Pope. They are to carry red portmanteaus containing the robes. Then follow the nephews of the Pope, or his near relations, and cardinals. There is also to be a ladder covered with red cloth. He is to carry in his hand a red stick. Then there are standards, two and two, that are red, and persons running before them also with red garments. There is likewise the standard of the Jerusalem order, also red. In fact, all is red—robes, staves, garments, bandboxes, all is of the scarlet colour in the ceremonial on that occasion. I need not add that the Cardinal receives, as a mark

of dignity, a red hat, and the Pope says to him, "I give you this red hat in token that you will be prepared to shed your blood for the elevation of the holy Mother Church. The Cardinal wears red gloves also. He has also red stockings. Black gaiters, I believe, are worn over them in this country, which will by-and-by be taken off, as the usage becomes acclimated, and the public more accustomed to the colour.

In Pugin's 'Glossary of Ecclesiastical Ornaments' are the following accounts of ancient Babylonish robes and splendour, and precious stones,—the very reading of which is a commentary on the Apocalypse:—"The jewels belonging to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln's mitre. To the forepart of the mitre, seven stones, blue and red, and eight clusters of pearls, with four in a cluster. Item, two angels, holding eight stones, and eighteen pearls." (P. 159.) In that mitre alone were several hundred precious stones and pearls.

Again,—"Mitres formerly belonging to the Cathedral Church of St. Paul: One mitre embroidered with stars before and behind, with stones set in plates of silver gilt. In the front are seven stones, and many pearls. Also a mitre which belonged to Henry Wengham, richly ornamented with golden plates, with trefoils set with stones and pearls." (P. 159.)

"Pontifical rings formerly belonging to the Cathedral Church at York. A great pontifical ring, with a stone called an emerald set in it. Item, a pontifical ring, with a large sapphire and twelve pearls." (P. 183.)

Again,—"Gold, mingled with silk and purple, enriches the sacerdotal vestments, and the hangings of the altar." (P. 137.)

The tiara, which is never worn by the Pope within

the church, it being the symbol of universal temporal sovereignty, has three circlets of gold, set with jewels.

"Red is the second canonical colour, of which there are three sorts, crimson, amethyst, and violet colour." (P. 178.)

"Lincoln Cathedral had a chasuble of red cloth of gold, set with pearls, blue, white, and red, with plates of gold enamelled. Item, a red cope, broidered with images of gold."

Let any one read the Apocalyptic inventory of the riches and jewellery of Babylon, and compare with it the descriptions of Mr. Pugin, or the beautiful paintings which he adds, and the conclusion will be irresistible that John's picture was drawn from the future, and that the future of the Church of Rome.

Rome boasts of her pomp and splendour; but it is the pomp and splendour of Babylon, not of Jerusalem. I see in her ornaments the trappings of the dead; I hear in her music the *miserere* of the oppressed, and over all her grandeur, to an eye enlightened by the Spirit of God, there must be read, "Ichabod, Ichabod, the true glory is departed." Brilliancy of style is not affluence of argument; buttercups on a field are not proofs of golden mines below; and all the splendour of Babylon is but the evidence to me that there is something at fault beneath, which that splendour is wanted to conceal. When a boy, going to school, I have seen a painter painting a new door, and putting extra coats of paint on different parts of the panels. Being inquisitive, I asked the man why he did so, and he said, "You see these are resinous flaws in the wood, and I am laying on extra coats of paint that they may not be seen when the whole is painted." The Church of Rome is conscious of

great flaws, of terrible shakes in her system, and she puts on extra coatings of decoration in order that they may be concealed. Our Protestant decorations should be of another stamp. Let our lives be the living pictures in our churches. For censers swinging with incense let us lift up holy hands; for decorated churches let our bodies be temples of the Holy Ghost; the girdle of our loins, let it be truth; our robe, let it be righteousness; and our mitre with its most precious gems, that "crown of righteousness that fadeth not away." If Rome be Babylon, all the splendour of her ritual only makes her a more splendid Babylon.

She is Catholic, it is said; that is, universal. I deny this claim. She has a few here and there. Open any history, and you must smile at her pretensions. Amid the millions of India, and the millions of China, is she universal there? The Church of Christ is universal in her destiny, but will not be universal historically until the dawn of the millennial day. The Church is Catholic in this sense,—that it has a religion for all people, for all nations, for all countries, and embraces all that love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. In that sense we are Catholic; but Catholic, in the sense of filling the whole world, we shall not be till the Millennium comes. The Church of Rome's assumption of Catholicity is only a part of that mimicry and antedating of the millennial Church which is her crime,—a part of that system in which the Pope places himself in the room of Christ, showing himself as if he were Christ, and she herself in the place of the Church of the future.

She also assumes to be Apostolic, an assumption in her case perfectly grotesque. Think of a Cardinal, with his pomp, splendour, and magnificence; and then of Peter hauling his net, or rowing about on

the lake of Galilee. The Apostolic Church said that a bishop should be the husband of one wife; the Church of Rome says that he must not, at his peril, be the husband of a wife at all. The Apostolic Church said, "We break one bread;" the Apostate Church says it ceases to be bread. The Apostolic Church said, "Prove all things;" Rome says, "Prove nothing at all, but take everything upon trust." The Apostolic Church said, "Bodily service profiteth little;" the Apostate Church says, "Penance, fasting, and other torturings of the body are most meritorious towards forgiveness of sin." She is truly Apostate,—not at all Apostolic. The Church of Rome also assumes sanctity. It is Babylonish, not Christian sanctity; it is not the holiness of the Scriptures. When we speak of a saint, we mean a Christian. The Epistle to the Philippians was written "to the saints at Philippi." The Church of Rome means by a saint a man like Liguori; who half starved himself, licked the ground before he ate his food, scourged himself till he nearly committed suicide, and lay upon thorns.

In the words of the Bishop of Lincoln, "This power, so described in the Apocalypse, is identified in this divinely inspired book "with,—

"(1) a great City; and that City is described as

"(2) seated on *seven hills.* It is also characterised as

"(3) *that Great City* which *reigned* over the kings of the earth in the time of St. John. And

"(4) it is called *Babylon.*

"Having contemplated these characteristics of this prophetic description, we pause, and consider,—*what* city in the world corresponds to it? It *cannot* be the *literal* Babylon, for *she* was not built on seven hills, nor was she the Queen of the Earth in St. John's age. It is some *Great City* which then existed, and

would continue to exist to our age. Among the very few great cities which then were, and still survive, One was seated on seven hills. She was universally recognised in St. John's age as *the* Seven-hilled City. She is described as such by the general voice of her own most celebrated writers for five centuries; and she has ever since continued to be so characterised. She is represented as such on her own coinage, the coinage of the world. This same city, and *no other*, then *reigned* over the kings of the earth. She exercised Universal Sovereignty, and boasted herself eternal. This same city resembled Babylon in many striking respects—in dominion, in wealth, in physical position and in historical acts, especially with regard to the ancient Church and People of God. This same city was commonly *called* Babylon by St. John's own countrymen, and by his disciples. And finally, the voice of the Christian Church, in the age of St. John himself, and for many centuries after it, has given an almost unanimous verdict on this subject—that the Seven-hilled City, that Great City, the Queen of the Earth, Babylon the Great of the Apocalypse, is the City of Rome."

It is the consolation of the people of God that her ruin is as certain as her rise. The height of arrogance, and crime, and cruelty, and pride to which she has risen above all Pagan precedent or parallel will render her fall only the more tremendous, and her destruction the more complete.

Her destruction is the burden of prophecy, and every sunset brings it nearer.

III.

THE ANTICHRIST.

We have in the inspired words of St. Paul a graphic description of the Head of Babylon the Great, the ruler of the Papacy: "Let no man deceive you by any means, for that day shall not come except there come a falling away,"—literally, "the Apostasy,"—"first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, who opposeth and exalteth himself,"—literally, "who lieth in wait,"—"above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. . . . For the mystery of iniquity" (this is another name) "doth already work; only he who now letteth" (or, according to its modern sense, "prohibiteth,") "will let, until he be taken out of the way." It is added, "And then shall that wicked one be revealed whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming; whose coming is after the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie."

It is not denied that there have existed somewhat different and conflicting interpretations of this remarkable passage. Roman Catholic commentators are directly at issue among themselves as to the meaning of the Apostle, or the personage to whom he refers; and some Protestant commentators express doubts respecting a few subordinate lights and shadows. Some Protestant clergymen, men who shrink from and have no affinity with Romanism, think that this prophecy describes a personage still future, and that while the Pope may be the present rude sketch of the man of sin, and Popery the rough cartoon, the outline remains to be filled in with intenser colours, while the character who they think is to come will be charged with darker and still more awful criminality. But I believe, in common with the most eminent divines, that it describes the Apostasy, and that apostasy the Church of Rome; and I think our materials illustrative of it are so complete, that if they were put into the 'Hue and Cry,' or announced in the 'Times' newspaper, a detective policeman in London would indicate the Pope, and maintain, "This is the man!" We have the sanction of almost all the best and most learned authorities for this interpretation. The great Reformation almost turned upon it. What says one of the homilies of the Church of England? "The Pope ought to be called the Antichrist and the successor of the scribes and Pharisees, not Christ's vicar and St. Peter's successor." "The Popes are worthily accounted among the false prophets and the false Christs." The Church of Scotland, in its Confession of Faith, which is adopted by various Presbyterian bodies that have separated from her, says: "The Pope is that man of sin and son of perdition that exalteth himself in the Church against Christ, and against all that is called God. The Irish Church,

never behindhand in its Protestantism, speaks nobly in her ancient Confession (Art. 80): "The Bishop of Rome's work and doctrines plainly discover him to be that man of sin foretold in Holy Scripture, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth, and destroy with the brightness of His coming." Archbishop Usher says: "As Christ is the head of His Church, which is His body, so Antichrist is the head of the Romish Church, which is his body." Cranmer declares: "As for the Pope, I refuse him as Christ's enemy and the Antichrist;" and his words are echoed by Latimer, Hooper, Bradford, Philpott, and others, who perfectly concur with him. Luther, in his Epistle to the Galatians, calls the Pope Antichrist: "The Pope is Antichrist, and vicar of Satan." "The Pope sits in God's temple, showing himself to be God; he is an enemy to God, and exalts himself above all that is called God." Dr. Sumner, a late Archbishop of Canterbury, takes the same view in his lectures on the Thessalonians.

This system is delineated in the Epistle to the Thessalonians as "the mystery of iniquity." Among the Arabs there was a system of what was called jewel writing—a sort of hieroglyphics, by which one can read the meaning conveyed by the arrangement and colours of jewels set in a crown. The ancient tiara of the Popes is said to have had jewels, signifying in that mode of writing (which a Jew who knew the secret was able to read) "Mystery, Babylon the Great; the mother of harlots." The Jews, it is said, thus arranged the precious stones, because they hated the Pope, as they hate him now. During the Revolution of 1848 the Jews were seen going through the streets of Rome, reading this passage in the Epistle to the Thessalonians, and declaring to the Romans, "This is your Pio Nono; he is not the Vicar of Christ, but the man of sin: do not let him

come back again." Well did the Jews know, as they still feel, that the instant he returned, instead of liberty prevailing there, such as is demanded by Romans in London, they would be thrown back into the *ghetto*, and treated like beasts of prey. The name is "the mystery of iniquity." This cannot be infidelity: infidelity has no mystery in it or about it: whatever be the distinctive features of the infidel, he is at least explicit: he says, "The Bible is a lie; there is no God: Jesus is not the Saviour." This is plain and unmistakeable; however dreadful, it is not mysterious. But this system is a mystery, and its history vindicates its character as such. It is an awful mystery that love should be elaborated into hate; that light should be made to issue in darkness; that love to brethren, and praying for one another, should be construed and practically translated into hate, and burning one another; that God's materials arranged for raising a temple vocal with His glory, should be seized and built into a temple ringing with the praises of them that are not divine; that the apostle Peter should be turned into and trusted as a demi-god; that the fishermen of Galilee should be developed into the kings and despots and high-priests of the earth; that the religion which humbles man should be made to exalt him; that the name of Jesus should be a mere decoration for the pretensions and made contributory to the glory and aggrandisement of man; that prayer should be made a punishment, repentance turned into penance, and the mother of Jesus practically (I do not say theoretically) exalted to equality with Jesus, the Son of God. Such combinations of truth ending in falsehood, light in darkness, godliness in sin, all that is bright, and beautiful, and holy translated into so much that is vile, unscriptural, and unholy;—this is indeed a mystery; and I know of nothing so much

entitled to the name as this system, which, to use the language of Father Ignatius, is "either the Church of Christ or the masterpiece of the devil." It is the perfect counterwork and correlative of "the mystery of godliness."

"The mystery of iniquity," says St. Paul, "doth already work." It is not, therefore, a thing that is to come down from the clouds, whole, perfect, and complete; it is a work, a process, a development; and the apostle says, "it doth already work;"—that is, the seeds of the system were sown in the days of the Apostles, and their fermentation and germination then began also. In fact, there prevailed in the Apostolic Churches what we have called by the modern name of Ritualism, which, meeting with congenial air, heat, and soil, developed itself into the well-known thing called Roman Catholicism. This is a decisive proof that no future system is contemplated. No other apostasy so named began in the days of Paul. Let us gather one or two seeds:—"Voluntary humility and worshipping of angels;" "strife and division;" "handling the word of God deceitfully;" "perverse disputings;" distinction of meats, feasts, fasts, and festivals; "philosophy, vain conceit, and the tradition of men;"—these were the seeds sown broadcast in the earliest Church; they germinated, and ultimately developed themselves into that system of Popery which culminated in the Council of Trent, and is completed in the Council of the Vatican. I do not wonder that the Pope does not circulate the Bible. The last thing that grace enables us to do is to love our enemy: the Pope must feel that the Bible is his enemy, and that he or it must go down. He may learn, if he will read and compare, that his picture is in the Bible, and it is time he should know the Divine contrast is there also. We may not say that Popery is not in the Bible,—it

is there; nor may we say that Protestantism is not in the Bible,—it also is there: but Protestantism is there with benedictions wreathed around its brow, the ambassadress of heaven, the benefactress of mankind; and Popery is in the Bible too, with the brand imprinted deep upon its brow, and its dread doom writ over it, "the mystery of iniquity," "the apostasy," and "the great persecutor of the saints and of the people of the Most High."

The next expression by which the Church of Rome is indicated and marked is "the Apostasy." The apostle calls it "the Apostasy" (ἡ ἀποστασια); for the definite article should be inserted in our version. What is an apostasy? Infidelity is not apostasy. An infidel is one who is in no sense or shape a Christian, and whose creed is not necessarily a departure from Christianity; but an apostate is one who has been a professing Christian, and has lapsed from his Christianity into something counter to it, or something that corrupts it. When the apostle Paul converted the Jews to Christianity, he was accused of making them apostatize from Moses. The apostle denied that he made them apostatize from or deny Moses. They accused Him of whom Moses wrote. In the Epistle to the Hebrews the apostle says, "Take heed lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, apostatizing from the living God." Speaking to Christians, the word "apostasy" is applicable to that which was once pure, or may still retain portions of truth, but has that truth set aside, perverted, distorted, and practically destroyed. The same idea may be further illustrated by a reference to the celebrated passage, "The Spirit speaketh expressly, that some shall depart (or literally apostatize) from the faith," a passage that specifies some of those things in which the apostasy consists, "giving heed to seducing spirit," "doctrines of demons,"

"speaking lies in hypocrisy." Apostasy is that which professes to hold the truth, but falls into something additional to the truth, which destroys, vitiates, and corrupts it. This is just what Romanism is: it holds the truth in the first twelve articles of its creed; it then adds thirteen other articles to its creed. These thirteen other articles constitute its distinctive errors; it applies to the twelve bright truths it has enunciated the thirteen dark blinds it has introduced, and so far vindicates its claim to be the Apostasy. Apostasy is the departure from truth, and involves the previous possession of truth. Truth is there, but it is dead in her creed; error is there, and is rampant and alive in her creed. Popery is wine turned into vinegar. *Corruptio optimi pessima.* A woman who becomes bad is much worse than a bad man. When an angel falls from his throne he does not halt in his descent until he sinks into the fiend, —the archangel ruined. Popery is the great truth corrupted into the great lie,—the ripe apostasy of which the apostle has spoken.

He shows us that out of this apostasy some one would emerge as its consolidated exponent, whom he calls "that man of sin." We may illustrate this phrase in some such a way as this; Jesus is called "the man of sorrows;" He was saturated with sorrow; we read that the blessed Saviour wept, never that He laughed. What a rebuke to much of our mirth! His life was steeped in tears, His heart was saturated with sorrow, and that sorrow the more poignant because it was our chastisement that was upon Him, and it was our sorrows that He bore. According to the same use of the expression, "the man of sin" (*i. e.* the official head of the apostasy) is one who is associated with sin, sanctioning it officially, authorising, approving, and promoting it, so much so that the practice of sin shall form one of the grand

elements of the system over which he presides. I need not add that I do not speak of the Pope personal; but of the Pope as head of the apostasy. The Pope, as Pope, is the grand patron of sin. I have read the pages of those dread documents in which the priests must be prepared, however young, for exercising the fearful functions of the Confessional; and I assert that no man can from his youth be schooled in those dread pages, and commit to memory, as they must do, their foul and polluting prescriptions, without having his soul tainted and contaminated to its core, and rendered incapable of what is pure, delicate, holy, beautiful. Or, if such persons are to be found holy, notwithstanding the pollution and the impurity to which they are exposed, they are among Rome's greatest miracles,—miracles, I fear, very rare indeed, as all history proves. No home can be pure into which the director finds admission to school the mistress of that home; no female can escape the vilest pollution who may be subjected to the inquisitorial questioning prescribed in the pages of St. Liguori, or in the official books of the Roman Catholic religion. I repeat what I have said before, that so foul is the whole system of the Confessional—I wish I could use language strong enough—that the very reason people do not know it is that no person dare print it in English or read it aloud. Its very pollution is, in this Protestant country, its protection. Yet every priest must read and study it, and catechise male and female, married and single, according to it. If it could be read in the hearing of the people, I believe they would rise in one fierce outburst of indignation against that vile system which has carried pollution so far as to have consecrated it.

But there is another ground on which the Pope may be called the Man of Sin; it is the distinction made by him between venial and mortal sin. I

will not now quote Liguori, but will come nearer home. There is a royal college in Ireland called the College of St. Patrick's, Maynooth. There was a class book formerly in use at that college, and given in as such to the House of Commons and the House of Lords, from which I will read an extract. It is called 'Bailly's Class Book.' It is asked, in vol. ii. c. 7, p. 232, "How great must be the quantity of the thing stolen to constitute the theft a mortal sin?" That is very odd morality. We are taught, according to our old-fashioned ethics, that there may be more sin in stealing a pin than in stealing a pound, because there is less temptation to steal in one case than in the other. However, in this book of theology it is said, "The quantity cannot be easily determined, since nothing has been decided on this point, either in natural, divine, or human law. . . . Hence, theologians are accustomed to distinguish men into four ranks. The first rank consists of the illustrious, who live in splendour; the second, of those who live on their own estates, but not so splendidly, —such as are moderately rich; the third, of artificers, who support themselves by their own labour and handicraft; the fourth, of the poor, who provide for themselves by begging. It is generally laid down, and you may lay it down as determined, that in order that a theft should be a mortal sin, when committed on persons of the first rank, fifty or sixty pence are sufficient." That is, you may steal from the Duke of Buccleuch, or other wealthy man, fifty-nine pence three farthings, and escape mortal sin; but if by the tenacity of the glue upon your fingers, or the passion in the heart, you seize the extra farthing, you plunge into a mortal sin at once. It is added, "With respect to persons of the second rank, forty pence are enough. With respect to persons of the third rank, if their trade be a lucrative one, twenty pence; if

less lucrative, ten pence. With respect to persons of the fourth rank, fourpence, or even one penny, if," it is added with exquisite *naïveté*, "they have nothing else to live on." Again, it is asked (p. 237), "Whether wives commit a mortal sin of theft, if, contrary to the reasonable wishes of their husbands, they secretly take anything considerable from the property which is under the power of their husbands." It is answered, "That they commit a mortal sin of theft, because they greatly injure the just right of their husband. But what quantity ought to be accounted considerable cannot easily be determined. This one thing is certain, that a greater quantity is required in thefts committed by a wife or a son than in thefts committed by strangers, because a husband or the father of a family is more unwilling that money should be taken by a stranger than by a wife or son." At page 239 the question is asked, "What is to be thought of servants who pilfer anything from their masters?" We Protestants have but one thought upon that subject; but let us hear how ingeniously they settle it at Maynooth: "They sin mortally if they pilfer a considerable quantity; venially, if a small quantity. But if they steal money or furniture, the same quantity is required to constitute a mortal sin as if they were strangers. If servants should plunder anything to eat, they do not always sin; that is to say, if it be some food which their masters would readily permit them to use if leave were asked from them." Notice next the closing provision. We have read that the monks were celebrated for having the most splendid wine cellars in mediæval days. It is therefore said that servants sin mortally "if they should make use of dainties and choice wines which the master wishes to reserve for himself, and which are not usually allowed to servants."

We have seen sin as it exists in the Confessional;

sin as it exists in these distinctions; and have pointed out the vast ingenuity displayed in teaching men how to steal, and yet not be guilty of theft. Another fact that connects the Pope with the Man of Sin is the nature of the privileges and indulgences which he grants. There is a valuable work by the Hon. Mr. Percy, who visited Rome, and has published all the inscriptions found on its churches. I have also read a much simpler work by Mr. Seymour, called 'A Pilgrimage to Rome,' in which inscriptions are also given. It is recorded that in the Church of St. Pietro, in Carcere, there is this inscription: "St. Sylvester grants every day to those who visit this church, twelve hundred years of indulgence, and every day besides, remission of a third part of their sins." Thus, if you die with thirteen hundred years of purgatorial punishment due to you, you will only suffer one hundred years; and if there are only a thousand due by you, you can transfer a couple of hundred to some needy neighbour who may have longer to suffer. On the inner wall of the Church of St. Sebastian there is a marble slab with the following inscription: "Whoso shall have entered this church shall obtain plenary remission of all his sins, through the merits of 174,000 holy martyrs, of 46 high pontiffs, and innumerable others." These are specimens of the indulgences offered. I have also another kind of indulgence connected with the Virgin Mary, of whom let me say, as the Virgin Mother of Jesus, I would speak with all the reverence due to an eminent and highly favoured Christian woman, and of whom it would be sinful and unscriptural to speak slightingly or disparagingly; but the Virgin Mary of the Church of Rome is not the Virgin Mary of the New Testament at all. The story goes that the Virgin Mary of the Church of Rome descended one day from heaven, and left her shoe on

her re-ascent, which has been accurately copied from the original in the monastery of Loretto; it was afterwards printed, and I now have a lithographed copy of it, framed and glazed, in my possession. The inscription is as follows—

"Vivo Maria santissima Vergine Madre di Dio. Giusta misura del Piede della Beatissima Madre di Dio, cavata dalla sua vera Scarpa, che si conserva con somma divozione in un Monastero di Loretto. Il Pontifice Giovanni XXII. concesse 300 anni d'Indulgenzia a chi bacerà tre volte questa misura, e vi recitera tre *Ave Maria*, lo che anche fù confermata da Papa Clemente VIII., l'anno di nostra Redenzione 1603.

"Questa Indulgenzia non avendo prescrizione di numero si puo acquistare quantè voltè si vorrà dai devoti di Maria Vergine Santissima. Si puo applicare alle Anime del Purgatorio. E' permesso a maggior gloria della Regina del Cielo di trarre da questa misura altre simili misure, le quali tutte avranno la medesima Indulgenzia.—Maria Mater Gratiæ, ora pro nobis."

"Long live Mary, the most holy Virgin Mother of God.—The just measure of the foot of the most blessed Mother of God, taken from her own shoe, which is preserved with the greatest devotion in a monastery of Loretto. Pope John XXII. granted 300 years' indulgence to any one who should kiss this measure three times, and say three *Ave Marias;* which was also confirmed by Pope Clement VIII. in the year of our redemption, 1603.

"This indulgence, having no prescribed number of years, can be acquired by any one who is devoted to the most Holy Virgin Mary. It can also be applied to souls in purgatory. And it is permitted, for the greater glory of the Queen of heaven, to take from this measure other similar measures, all of which shall have the same indulgence.—Mary, Mother of Grace, pray for us."

Three hundred years' indulgence for kissing this copy of the slipper of the Virgin Mary! There is just as much virtue in the indulgence as there is truth in the story: the one is an unscriptural delusion; the other is a piece of imposition.

We might analyse the character of the Popes, but I will not do so. Many Protestants err in this respect. To prove that the Pope is the Man of Sin, they quote the life of such a Pope as John XII. or Borgia; and then the Roman Catholic quotes in

reply bad Protestant ministers. It is not, however, the *personal,* but the *official,* which we are to look at; it is the system, not the individual.

The Man of Sin is also called "that wicked one;" but, unfortunately, our translation is not quite correct in this expression. The Greek word is ἄνομος, meaning a person without law. The Roman Emperor was said to be *legibus solutus,* on which Gibbon remarks: "The expression was supposed to exalt the Emperor above all human restraint, and to leave his conscience and reason as the only measure of his conduct." In this country every man is the subject of the law—from the Queen upon her throne to the meanest of her subjects. We all move in the orbit of the law. But it can be proved that the Pope of Rome assumes to be above all law, dispensing, annulling, altering, and repealing it, when, where, and how often he pleases. Having the Canon Law in my possession, to set up which the Roman hierarchy was instituted among us, I can illustrate the great Romish outlaw:

The Canon Law says—

"*Nemo judicabit primam sedem justitiam temperare desiderantem; neque enim ab Augusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a regibus, neque a populo judex judicabitur.*" — (Innoc. Decret. Grat. Sec. pars. caus. 9 quest. 3. can. 13. col. 522. Lips. 1839.)

"*No one shall judge the first See, when it desires to administer justice; for neither by the Emperor, nor by all the clergy, nor by kings, nor by the people, can the judge be judged.*"

The Pope, in the same Canon Law, says—

"Facta subditorum judicantur a nobis, nostra vero judicat Deus."—(Ibid. can. 15.)

"Romanus Pontifex jura omnia in scrinio pectoris sui censetur habere." — Sext. Decret, lib. I. tit. 2. c. 1. col. 901. Lips. 1839.)

"The deeds of subjects are judged by us, but we are judged by God."

"The Roman Pontiff has all laws in the casket of his own bosom."

"Romanus Pontifex canonice institutus nullo humano judicio judicari potest, nisi fiat hereticus." — (Cerem. vol. 1. p. 160. Romæ, 1751.)

"The Roman Pontiff, canonically instituted, can be judged by no human authority, unless he become a heretic."

"Juramentum contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam prestitum non tenet." — (Decret. Greg. 9. lib. 2. vol. 24. c. 4. col. 347. Lips. 1837.)

"An oath contrary to ecclesiastical utility is not binding."

"Non juramenta sed perjuria potius dicenda quæ contra ecclesiasticam utilitatem attentantur." —(Ibid. c. 27. c. 358.)

"They are to be called perjuries rather than oaths, which are attempted contrary to the advantage of the Church."

In some Irish Catechisms what is called by us the Second Commandment, but what the Church of Rome calls three-fourths of the First Commandment, beginning, "Thou shalt not make to thyself any likeness," &c., is omitted. In an Italian Catechism purchased in Rome, and issued on the authority of Gregory XVI., the former Pope, the Second Commandment is left out, and the Fourth Commandment reads thus: "Remember to keep holy the festivals." Such is evidence of the defiance of Divine and human law by this great ἄνομος, "the outlaw." The Pope has the power to decree that the Sabbath shall only be observed for two, three, or four hours, if he pleases so to decide, says Liguori. Let us also see how he contradicts and repudiates God's law. God says: "Marriage is honourable in all men;" the Pope of Rome says, in a bishop it is disgraceful. Jesus says in the New Testament: "Drink ye all of it;" the Pope says, none shall drink of it but the officiating priest. If a dozen priests were to kneel at a Roman Catholic altar, the officiating priest would not give the cup to one of them: he not only refuses it to the laity, but even to the other priests. Now when our Lord officiated, he gave the cup to the apostles, who the Church of Rome says were priests, and said, "Drink ye all of it." The Pope says, Let only the officiating

priest drink. Jesus says, "Search the Scriptures." The Roman outlaw says more harm than good will arise from the indiscriminate reading of them in the vulgar tongue. Some people say the Pope does not allow his people a copy of the Bible. This is a mistake; it may be had with a license, which must be obtained from the bishop or the inquisitor. No Roman Catholic bookseller has a right to sell a Bible in the language of the country unless he has obtained a license to do so from his bishop. Rome does allow the laity to possess the Bible, but not in the vulgar tongue. If you say to a priest, "You don't allow the people the Bible," he will say, "We do;" but if you add, "You do not allow it to the laity in the vulgar tongue," he will admit this or be silent. Yes; the Pope will allow English people, I presume, to have the Bible in French, Frenchmen to have it in German, Germans to have it in Dutch, Dutchmen to have it in Russian, Scotchmen in Irish, and Irishmen in English—provided it is in a tongue the purchasers do not understand. In the Bible we read, "There is forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared;" but the Pope assumes that forgiveness is with him. There is another beautiful text, "The blood of Jesus cleanseth from all sin." The Pope says, "No, it does not; Purgatory must burn out hereafter what that precious blood has failed to cleanse the sinner from in this world."

Another specimen of the lawlessness of this "anomos" may be seen in the Canon Law; where it is said the tribunals and courts of kings are subject to the power of the priests. "*Tribunalia regum sacerdotali sunt potestati subjecta.*" (P. 18, b. 1, c. 6.) Again, "*Constitutiones principum ecclesiasticis legibus postponendæ sunt.*" The "Archbishop of Westminster" believes that; and he believes that the Court of Queen's Bench is under him; and if he

had the power, which he has not yet, notwithstanding his meekness he would make the judges do his bidding. But, thank God! he has not that power; and, by God's grace, he never shall have it. Even to him we dare not trust it.

Our Government some years ago, in exercising what they believed to be a large liberality, instituted colleges in Ireland for educating the people in secular knowledge without religion. Well, any light in Ireland is a blessing. Teach an Irish Romanist chemistry; teach him science; and so far you do him good; because what Rome loves is darkness, and darkness it will and must have where it can. It dreads intellectual light as the owl retreats from the sunrise. The Government resolved to institute Queen's Colleges for teaching the people without introducing any religion. A Synod of Bishops met, with the "Lion of the Tribe of Judah," as he calls himself—commonly called John of Tuam—and condemned those colleges. The decision of the Pope respecting them duly arrived, practically saying, "Queen Victoria may set up these colleges; the House of Lords and the House of Commons may build them; but we command that no Roman Catholic whatever shall enter them, or have anything to do with them." This is the power he exercises in the heart of our country, defying the law of the realm, and the rescripts of the Sovereign herself. What does the Archbishop of Westminster say in his pastoral? "We govern, and continue to govern." We set against that the reply of Queen Victoria, "We govern, and will continue to govern." And what does the Archbishop of Westminster say again? "By favour of the Apostolic See, Archbishop of Westminster." We answer, "By the grace of God," for it is still upon our coins, "Victoria, Queen of Great Britain and Ireland."

This lawless one, it is said, exalteth and opposeth himself (*αντικειμενος*), or lieth in wait, "exalteth himself above all that is called God, sitting in the temple of God, and showing himself that he is God." "He exalteth himself above all that is called God." There are two explanations of this feature: one is that it alludes to the consecrated host, which the Roman Catholic calls his God, and above which the Pope is enthroned; but it seems much more probable that "gods" alludes to magistrates. For instance, we read in Exodus xxii. 28, "Thou shalt not revile the gods. Again, in Psalm lxxxii., "I have said, Ye are gods." John x. 35, "If he called them gods unto whom the Word of God came." 1 Corinthians viii. 5, "For though there be that are called gods, whether in heaven or in earth, (as there be gods many and lords many,) but to us there is but one God." I take it, therefore, that the allusion in this place is to magistrates. What, then, is the fact? In the *Ceremoniale Romanum* I read—

"Romanus Pontifex nemini omnium mortalium reverentiam facit, assurgendo, aut caput inclinando seu detegendo. Solent Pontifices Cardinalibus, et maximis principibus, cum non sint in Pontificalibus, aliquantulum caput inclinare tamquam reverentiam reddentes, et hoc non ex officio, sed ex laudabili humanitate."—(Ceremon. vol. ii. p. 330. Romæ, 1751.)

"The Roman Pontiff does reverence to no human being, by rising, or bowing, or uncovering his head. When not in their pontificals Pontiffs may incline their heads a little to Cardinals and the greatest princes, when they are doing homage—not, however, officially, but out of a laudable humanity."

Catalano, commenting on this, adds—

"Deberi et hunc honorem Pontifici ab Imperatoribus, Regibusque, ac summis principibus, ut ipsi genua flectant ejusque pedes deosculantur, atque stratoris officio fungantur, aut habenas equi regant."

"This honour is also due to the Pontiff by emperors, kings, and the highest princes, who should bend the knee to him, kiss his feet, and perform the office of groom, or hold the reins of his horse."

"Si vero pontifex non equo sed sella veheretur, quatuor majores principes, etiamsi inter eos Imperator Rex aut quivis maximus princeps adesset, in honorem Jesu Christi, sellam ipsam cum Pontifici humeris suis portare aliquantulum debent."—(Ceremon. ut supra.)

"Episcopus non debet subesse principibus, sed præesse."

"If the Pontiff, instead of riding on horseback, should be carried in a chair, four of the greatest chiefs (though there should be amongst them an emperor, a king, or some great prince) should carry the chair a little on their shoulders, in honour of Jesus Christ."

"A bishop ought not to be subject to princes but rule over them."

The Canon Law adds—

"Quanta est inter solem et lunam tanta inter pontifices et reges differentia."

"The difference between Pontiffs and kings is as great as that between the sun and the moon."

As a striking specimen of the ludicrous folly sanctioned in the offices of Rome, I may mention that in the *Ceremoniale*, with Catalano's notes, it is ordered when a Pope is consecrated that the Cardinals shall lead him by the hand, and make him recline gently on a long marble table. After he has reclined they are to lift him up, and are to say, "Thus God takes the needy from the dunghill, and lifts him up to be numbered among princes!" The *Ceremoniale* states, when the Pope is carried on the shoulders of four kings, or rides upon his horse, he is to fill his hands with money, but first he is to take care that there shall be no silver or gold in his hands mixed with the copper coins. He distributes the money, from which he has picked out and pocketed the gold and silver, right and left among the people, as he is borne through the crowd, shouting as loud as he can, "Gold and silver have I none, but such as I have give I unto you." There are many other historical illustrations of this pontifical arrogance too numerous to repeat. History shows that papal pretensions never were a dead letter. Otho received his crown

as a papal grant. Charlemagne received his title of Emperor as a donative from the Pope. Adrian IV. on King Henry's petition permitted him to go to Ireland, on condition of his giving the Roman See a quit rent of a penny for each house. On the discovery of America, Prince Henry of Portugal applied to the Pope to grant the Portuguese every country they might discover; and a Bull was issued in which it was said that the Pope granted the request "because he shall reign from sea to sea, and from the rivers to the ends of the earth." Louis II. and the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa held the bridle of Pope Nicholas. Henry IV. spent three days in a ditch, on a cold winter's night, with bare feet, surrounded with snow, until the Pope gave him absolution. Pope Celestine kicked the crown off the head of the Emperor Henry VI. Pope Pius V. excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and Pope Pius IX. would with perfect consistency excommunicate Queen Victoria if he could.

The Man of Sin is said again to be exalted "above all that is worshipped." This does not mean religious worship. The Greek word is *σέβασμα*, which means an object of veneration. The Emperor (in Latin *Augustus*) was called *σέβαστος*, as a title of high official dignity. The Man of Sin, then, is "exalted above all that is called god"—that is, above civil magistrates, and "above all that is worshipped;" that is, all to whom reverence is due. So that the loyalty we owe to kings, the reverence we owe to parents, the affection we owe to children, (for to denounce the heretic, whether son, or wife, or father, or mother, is a sacred duty, according to the rescripts of Rome,) the obedience due to husbands,—all is to be absorbed and merged in the illimitable exactions of obedience the Pope makes on his subjects; he is the great German Berserker who feeds

upon all sorts of creatures, appropriating the strength of each in order to add to his own giant power.

"The Man of Sin" also "sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself as if he were God." The "temple of God," it is argued by some, means the temple of Jerusalem; but first, there was no temple in existence at Jerusalem at the period to which the apostle alludes, as that of the initial manifestation of the man of sin; our Lord's predictions have settled this. Secondly, the Jewish temple was never called the temple of God after the Jews had rejected Christ. Thirdly, by Jews speaking to Jews it was called the temple of God at Jerusalem; but by a Christian apostle writing to Gentile Christians, and especially in a prediction of the future, it would never be so called. Fourthly, the Greek word used is not *ἱερον*, but *ναος*, a word never used by the apostles to denote the temple of Jerusalem. If it be the temple of Jerusalem to be rebuilt, as some say, by Antichrist, into which the Man of Sin is to enter and be adored, it could not be called the temple of God; it would be rebuilt by Antichrist, and would be his temple, and no more the temple of God than the mosque of Omar. The word *ναος* was used to describe the holiest place of a heathen temple, where the image of the deity was; corresponding to what we call the chancel, the choir, or the altar end of a church. The words are, "He sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." Let us read the following from the *Ceremoniale*:—

"Imponunt novo pontifici pluviale rubeum pretiosum, et mitram auro et gemmis ornatam; illumque sedere faciunt super altare cui cardinales omnes reverentiam exhibent per ordinem, pedes, manus, et os deosculantes." — (*Ceremoniale Romanum*, Vol. i. p. 75.)

"Upon the newly consecrated Pope they put the scarlet precious pluvial, and a mitre ornamented with gold and gems; they then make him sit upon the high altar, where the cardinals give him reverence in succession, kissing his feet, his hands, and his mouth."

Catalano, quoting the account of the election of Pius II. adds—

"In altari positus a cardinalibus adoratus est."	"When placed upon the high altar he is adored by the cardinals."

Let us not forget what the high altar in the Church of Rome is. It is the place where the priest tells us he changes a piece of bread into the soul, divinity, body, and blood of the Son of God, and where he keeps the Saviour in a pyx. When a Roman Catholic kneels to his altar, he does a consistent thing—he believes God is on it; but when a Ritualist does so, he perpetrates a sham, for he kneels only to a piece of bread. Protestantism is consistency, Popery is consistency, but Ritualism is a huge inconsistency. Another evidence of the Pope's exaltation is presented in the cast of a coin struck at and sent me from Rome, having on it the representation of two cardinals putting a tiara on a Pope's head, with the inscription, *Quem creant adorant*—"Whom they create they worship." Another cast represents a king kneeling, and a pope waving his hand and blessing him, saying, "Thus shall the world be blessed." It is not written that the Pope *says* he is God, but that he *shows* himself as if he were God; he assumes the position and the dignity that belong to God only. 'L'Univers,' a Roman Catholic newspaper, in giving an account of the consecration of the Pope, says: "Pius IX. was seated on the high altar, and was *adored* by the cardinals;" and Eustace, a Roman Catholic priest, who writes a 'Classic Tour through Italy,' says he was shocked by seeing, in his own church, the Pope enthroned where Christ the living God alone should be, and he earnestly remonstrates against it. Let us see also what is said of the Pope by others. Bellarmine says—

"Si aut Papa erraret, præcipiendo vitia vel prohibendo virtutes, teneretur ecclesia credere vitia esse bona et virtutes malas, nisi vellet contra conscientiam peccare."

"If the Pope should err, by commanding vices or prohibiting virtues, the Church is bound to believe vices to be good and virtues bad, unless she would sin against conscience."

Surely, whoever claims to supersede conscience, and to put his hand into that holy place, assumes the prerogative of God, and shows himself as if he were God. The following language, applied to the Pope, is in the Canon Law:—

"Si Papa suæ et fraternæ salutis negligens deprehenditur inutilis et remissus et operibus suis et insuper a bono taciturnus, quod magis officit sibi et omnibus, nihilominus innumerabiles populos catervatim secum ducit primo manicipio gehennæ cum ipso plagis multis in eternum vapulaturos hujus culpas istic redarguere præsumit mortalium nullus quia cunctos ipse judicaturus, et nemine est judicandus nisi deprehendatur a fide devius." (Distinct. 40. p. 126. Decreti prima pars, Lips. 1839.)

"If a Pope, forgetful of his own and his brethren's salvation, is silent from good, so that he injures himself and all besides, insomuch that he drags down innumerable multitudes of people to be eternally punished with himself with many stripes in the bondage of hell, no mortal presumes to find fault with his sins, because he who is to judge all is to be judged by none."

I once received a note from a friend who had stated that in the Canon Law the Pope is called "Our Lord God the Pope," and that he had been taken to task by a priest on that account. The priests are always quiet until they get hold of what they think a good thing, out of which they can make capital. The passage is as follows:—

"Satis evidenter ostenditur a seculari potestate nec ligari prorsus nec solvi posse Pontificem quem constat a Pio principe Constantino Deum appellatum, nec posse Deum ab hominibus judicari manifestum est."—(Distinctio q. 6. c. 7. Decreti pars prima, p. 290, Lips. 1839.)

"It is plainly shown that the Pope cannot be bound or loosed by the civil power, who it is obvious was called God by Constantine; and it is clear that God cannot be judged by man."

That is, the Pope is here called God, but the words are not "*Noster Dominus Deus.*" In the Canon Law, however, prior to the fifteenth century, these words were inserted. I suppose they were so ashamed of them that they struck out *Noster Dominus,* but they forgot to leave out *Deus,* which is the strongest word of all, and this remains in the Canon Law to this day. On the gate of Tolentino there is or was the following inscription,—"*Paulo III., optimo maximo Deo in terris*:"—"To Paul the Third, a god on earth."

Baronius, speaking of John of Constantinople as opposing the Pope, describes him as setting himself against the Most High God. The words "sitteth in" are in the Greek *καθισαι εις τον ναον,* "to sit into," and imply being carried or moved towards, as the Pope is carried towards the high altar. *Cathedral* is derived from the same root, and means literally a sitting place; it is now the place where a bishop has his throne or the chief seat (*sedem*) of the see or diocese over which he presides. Thus, this man, as a bishop, sits in his cathedral, which is the "temple of God," showing himself, by sitting above the high altar, as if he were actually God himself. Our version is not perfectly exact:—*ὁ ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον Θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς Θεὸν καθίσαι ἀποδεικνύντα ἑαυτον ὅτι ἐστὶ Θεός.* It appears that the preposition *ἐπὶ* ought to be construed with both the participles *ἀντικείμενος* and *ὑπεραιρόμενος.* Our translators render the passage, "who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped," *κ. τ. λ.* But that rendering would have required the preposition *ὑπὲρ,* not *ἐπὶ*; and such an expression as *ἀντικείμενος* requires *ἐπὶ,* not *ὑπὲρ,* with the *accusative.* The correct translation is "who opposeth," ("lieth in wait against, as against his prey,") "and exalteth himself over and against

all that is called God, or the object of worship, so as to seat himself in the temple of God, as God, showing himself that he is God." Dr. Bloomfield, in a note on the passage in his larger Greek Testament, says, "render ὥστε, 'insomuch that.'" But that is not the meaning of ὥστε.

The next title, which has occasioned some dispute, has reference to the word Antichrist. It is said that the Pope is not opposed to Christ, and that you cannot therefore call him Antichrist. But the word Antichrist does not mean opposed to Christ. In innumerable instances this prefix means, not *against*, but *taking the place of*. Thus in classic usage ανθυπατος, or αντι ὑπατος, means a pro-consul, one who takes the place of a consul, not one who is opposed to him; αντιβασιλευς, a *pro-rex*, one who takes the place of a king; αντιτυπον, a copy, corresponding to the original. Homer says that Achilles was ὡς αντιλεων, "equal in strength to a lion." We have all read of the Antipopes; they were not opposed to the Popedom, but were fighting for it; and so anxious were they to get it, that they did all they could to dislodge the person who had possession of it. Antichrist, then, does not mean one who is opposed to Christ, but one who takes the place of Christ. This is exactly the action of Popery. What is the Pope's title? The Vicar of Christ. When there is a vicar in a parish, it means that the rector is absent. So with the presence of "the Vicar of Christ." Christ is in the midst of two or three met together in His name, while in perfect contrast Antichrist is in the midst of two or three hundred thousand met together in *his* name; the last, the Apostasy; the first, the Church of the living God.

Is Christ the Good Shepherd? the Pope begins one of his Bulls by claiming this title. Has Christ the key that opens, and no man shuts? The Pope

professes to have it. Bellarmine says: "The Pope is the father of the faithful—the pontiff of Christians —the prince of priests—vicar of Christ—head of the body—foundation of the building—bridegroom of the Church." The Romish Church is an attempt to anticipate the millennial Church, and the Pope a truly blasphemous mimicry of Christ when He comes and reigns over it. In a reply to an address to him in Rome a few years ago, Pio Nono said, "I am the Successor of the Apostles, the Vicar of Jesus Christ; I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life."

It would be easy to show at great length how the Pope, in every respect, assumes to take the place of Christ, but space would fail me.

It has been argued by some that a person called "the lawless one, the man of sin," must be an individual, and not a succession of persons. No doubt it is and must mean a succession of persons. In Daniel, we read of four kings, the heads of four successive empires—that is confessedly a succession of kings. In Heb. ix. 7, we read, "Into the second went the high priest alone once every year;" that was not an individual, but an office held by many in succession. So in the Revelation, the woman treading on the moon (xii. 1) and the woman sitting on the Beast (xiii. 1) are admitted by all commentators to be individuals made the types of successive persons. The woman is a type of a society. So the Man of Sin is the head and representative of a society: and just as "he that letteth" means the Roman Emperors, so "he that sitteth" means the Roman Popes,—not one person, but a succession of persons, one wearing a crown, the other a tiara. It may be said that the Pope does not deny Christ. John, in his Epistle, says, "He is antichrist that denieth the Father and the Son;" and he says again, "Every spirit that confesseth not that Jesus Christ

is come in the flesh is not of God; and this is that spirit of antichrist whereof ye have heard that it should come." A few years ago the Pope decided that the Virgin Mary was born immaculate, that she was not in the lineage and line of sinners, but was lifted out of it, and does not, therefore, belong to the grand category of humanity. Now, if Christ was born of one who was lifted above and out of my nature, then his descent is affected, and ancient prophecies are unfulfilled. In other respects it may be shown that the Pope nullifies this great truth. The incarnation is the manifestation of Christ as a Priest; but the Pope supersedes that; the manifestation of Christ as a Prophet, but the Pope supersedes that; and the manifestation of Christ as a King,—and the Pope assumes this dignity for himself. Augustine, to whom Roman Catholics must defer, says—

"Quicunque negat quod Jesus sit Christus ipse est Antichristus. Jam ergo quæramus quis negat, et non attendamus ad linguam, sed ad facta. Si enim omnes interrogentur omnes uno ore confitentur Jesum esse Christum. Quiescat paululum lingua, vitam interroga. Si ipsa Scriptura nobis dixerit quod negatio non tantum linguâ fit sed factis, certe invenerimus multos Antichristos qui ore profitentur Christum, et moribus dissentiunt a Christo. Ubi invenimus hoc in sacra Scriptura? Paulum audi Apostolum: de talibus cum loquitur ait, 'Confitentur enim se nosse Deum, factis autem negant.' Quisquis factis, negat Christum Antichristus est."

"Whosoever denies that Jesus is the Christ, is Antichrist. If we would know who denies this, we must judge by deeds, and not by words. For all, if they were asked, would with one mouth confess that Jesus is the Christ. Let the tongue be silent, while we interrogate the life. If the Scripture itself tells us that a denial is made not so much by words as by deeds, truly we shall find many antichrists who confess Christ with their lips, but reject him by their lives. Where in the sacred Scriptures do we find this? Listen to the Apostle Paul, who, speaking of such things, says, 'They profess to know God, but in deeds deny him.' Whoso denies Christ is Antichrist."

Edwards, a most distinguished divine, says that Luther, Calvin, Beza, Rivet, and all the divines of the Reformation held the Pope to be Antichrist.

"All the ancient doctors and divines of our own Church," says an eminent writer of the Church of England, "were steadfast in this persuasion." Tyndal, Fox, Latimer, Jewel, Archbishop Parker, Archbishop Whitgift, when he was made D.D. (1566), maintained this thesis, "*Papa est ille Antichristus;*" and of the same opinion were Whittaker, Rainolds, Archbishop Grindal, Archbishop Abbot, Bishop Andrews, Bishop Morton, Bishop Gibson, Willet, Sutcliffe, Hooker, Bishop Davenant, and Bishop Hall. Dr. Jackson, a very learned divine, says: "The Papists see as little concerning Antichrist as the Jews saw concerning Christ; for as the latter still look for the Messiah, who is already come, so the former expect an Antichrist who hath been for a long time revealed, and is reverenced by them as a God." (Creed, b. iii. c. 8.) Again: "He who will not acknowledge the Papacy to be the kingdom of Antichrist hath great reason to suspect his heart, that if he had lived with our Saviour he would scarce have taken Him for the Messiah." (b. iii.) The translators of the Bible called the Pope the Man of Sin; and he is also so called in the Articles of Religion agreed to by the bishops and clergy in Ireland.

He that letteth, *i.e.*, prevents, is almost universally interpreted to be the Roman Emperors. Tertullian says: "Christians prayed for Roman Emperors, for by their continuing to do so the grievous calamity of an Antichrist is hindered." So Jerome, Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Cyril. Ambrose says: "After the death of the Roman Emperors Antichrist appears." Gibbon says: "Rome had reached about the close of the fifth century the lowest period of her depression. Like Thebes, Babylon, or Carthage, the name of Rome must have been erased from the earth if the city had not been animated

by a vital principle, which again restored her to honour and dominion. The temporal power of the Popes insensibly arose from the calamities of the times." When Constantine removed the seat of the empire to Constantinople, one letting power was removed.

The Man of Sin is next called "the son of perdition,"—that is, he is doomed to be destroyed; he is judged already at a tribunal from which he can make no appeal; his destruction is as certain as his crimes. Babylon is foredoomed of God.

Then it is said that his coming is "after the working of Satan." Satan's power is in the Church of Rome; his policy pervades it. The archangel's wisdom and the fiend's depravity are combined and concentrated there. Read the tales of the Inquisition, and the deeds that have been done in the name of religion by the Roman Catholic Church; and the able defences made by herself. No human invention is that Church. It is Satan's last and greatest effort.

We then read of the "lying wonders." This does not strictly mean false wonders, but wonders establishing lies. The Church of Rome may yet, before she is swept away, do supernatural things, as I am inclined to think she has done. If the devil has supernatural wisdom, by which he assaults men, he may have superhuman power, by which he arms men. No supernatural deed, however, can authenticate a contradiction of God's Holy Word. If they were to raise a man from the dead, and say to me, "We prove by this miracle that the Virgin Mary is to be worshipped as the Queen of heaven,"—even if an angel were to come down from heaven and say so, I would add, "Let him be anathema," for an apostle has told me to reject him and his testimony altogether. A miracle is simply a proof that there is

more than man present; but the message determines whether the power is from beneath or from above,—the mighty power of God, or the supernatural power of the wicked one. God's word is with us alone the decisive test.

Let me notice some of the wonders said to be performed by the Church of Rome, in confirmation of her lies, reserving a full account for a subsequent chapter. At Lucca there is a representation of Christ, made by Nicodemus, who was ordered by our Lord to do so. He finished the picture, all except the face, and then fell asleep, when our Lord descended, and completed it. There is a handkerchief of St. Veronica, on which the face of our Lord is said to be miraculously impressed. In the church of St. Pietro de Martino there is a representation of the Virgin and her Child, with an inscription on marble,—"This sacred likeness of Mary the Mother of God, and her Holy Infant Son, is illustrious for miracles more and more every day." In St. Peter's at Rome there is a picture of the Virgin, with a mark under the left eye, and an inscription,—"This picture, having been struck by an impious hand, poured forth blood on the stone which is now protected by a grating." I need not refer to the winking Virgin of Rimini, of whom all have heard. In the cathedral church at Amiens I saw what was said to be the skull of John the Baptist, in a glass case; I also saw a man kissing it and praying over it. It is well known that there are two other skulls; but the Roman Catholics say: "If there be three altogether, one must be right, and the best way is to kiss the whole of them!" Another striking evidence of the "lying wonders" of the Church of Rome was exhibited at the time of the cholera in Italy. Abbé Menghi d'Arville records the following:—"The Pope could discover no means by which to arrest the

course of the pestilence except the invocation of the Mother of God, and had recourse to her intercession. Although the holy Pontiff preached repentance, ordained prayer, and made vows, the plague ceased not its ravages until he made the resolution of turning altogether to the Mother of God. Then he commanded the clergy and people to go in a procession to the church of our Lady, called Santa Maggiore, and to carry the picture of the holy Virgin, painted by St. Luke, to the church of St. Peter. The procession perfectly arrested the progress of the pestilence. It was a delightful miracle to behold how the pestilence ceased entirely along the streets through which the procession passed. Enthusiasm was at its height when the miraculous picture appeared in its place in St. Maria Maggiore. The *Eviva Maria!* at the moment reached to heaven. They place the august picture on the pontifical altar; the litanies are chanted, and the holy Pope, assisted by Cardinal Odeschalchi, high priest of the Church, offers incense to it and utters a prayer full of sweet hope, while his countenance displays the expression that Mary has heard the vows and prayers of her people." The holy coat at Trèves is another miracle. Every saint canonized in the Church of Rome must have wrought miracles. St. Thomas à Becket was illustrious for innumerable miracles. There is still, I believe, a procession at Brussels to commemorate a host that bled when a Jew pierced it. Then we have the liquefying blood of St. Januarius, and the miraculous transportation of Pilate's staircase into Rome. I have myself seen a piece of the wood of the true cross; and bits of it are found in almost every cathedral on the Continent; indeed, some one has remarked that there is as much wood of the true cross as would build a seventy-four gun ship. The great pillars of the

Jesuits wrought miracles. Ignatius Loyola, they say, wrought greater miracles than Christ. Christ expelled demons by a word, Ignatius by a letter; Christ walked upon the sea once, Ignatius often; Christ amazed his disciples by his transfiguration; Ignatius entered a dark room, and it instantly became light. Ribadineira, fifteen years after the death of Ignatius, wrote his Life in 1572, but makes no mention of miracles performed by him; and Maffei wrote his Life in 1585, without making the least mention of them. All his miracles seem to have been discovered long after his death. These are some of the specimens of the lying wonders of the Church of Rome.

It is added, "with all deceivableness of unrighteousness." Here is the danger of the Church of Rome. If we were born living and truly regenerated Protestants, I should have no fear of the success of the Church of Rome; but we have an enemy within the camp, in every one of our hearts, and therefore there is a congenial soil for Popery to grow in. It is an ever wakeful, ever subtle serpent. The danger of the Church of Rome lies greatly in its "deceivableness of unrighteousness," palatable to the natural man, pacifying to the conscience without purifying the heart. It is deceivableness to make a hundred Pater Nosters on the lip better than one "Our Father" from the heart; to make the carrying of the cross upon the shoulder greater glory than glorying in the cross; to make a genuflexion with the knee as good as to keep unbroken the commandment; to feast in Carnival, and fast in Lent, as sacred and solemn duties. It is worthy of notice that all the great advocates of fasting generally turn out great practitioners of feasting. The great fastee of Lent is the great feastee of the previous fashionable season; feasting and fasting, playing at see-

saw, the one compensating for the other with inimitable precision, and much to the advantage of the patient. The "deceivableness of unrighteousness" is that Rome finds out each man's humour, and suits herself to him. Are you lazy, and will not work? The Apostolic prescription is, that "you should not eat;" the Romish is, to go into a monastery, or live by begging. If you are a solitary or ascetic person, you can go to a hermitage. If you are of a severe temperament, they will give you a whip to scourge yourself with like Liguori, who once so lashed himself that four monks rushed in and snatched the "discipline" out of his hand, to save him from suicide. Just conceive a saint on the brink of suicide and self-murder represented as the perfection of piety! If you are a licentious debauchee, there is a sympathizing father into whose bosom you can pour your past story, and from whose lips you may hear absolution for your offences. Is it some blighted and disappointed affection that you suffer from? There is the charming retreat of a nunnery. Are you very avaricious? You may have a surplus of merit proportioned to your wealth. Are you a robber? A tithe of past plunder may help you to heaven. Are you tasteful? There are the fine arts for you to admire. And for Christians, there is just enough Christianity left to save their religion from being rank infidelity. There is room at the Pope's table for every guest, with or without the wedding garment; and there are sauces at his poisonous feast suited to every palate and appetite. In the Romish system there is the barefooted Passionist, like Father Ignatius; and in another place the pomp and splendour of a Cardinal in red. On one side of the water there is the austerity of the Capuchin; and on the other the large, rubicund, and unfasting prince of the Church. There is the poverty of the mendi-

cant, and the wealth of the prelate, masques, and foolery, and feasting to-day, fasts and scourges to-morrow; excommunications fulminated against all Christendom one year, and a jubilee and indulgence pronounced on the next. It is a religion that fits every man, and turns every man's peculiarity to account.

IV.

INFALLIBLE ŒCUMENICAL COUNCILS.

So much is said in favour of Œcumenical Councils that a brief history of some of them seems to be required. If there be no seat of infallibility except in a Pope or in a Council, this great attribute must be still at large.

Let us review the least exceptionable of the representative Councils of the ancient Christian Church,—the General Council of Nice, held in 325. It has been lavishly praised for its orthodoxy. But an inspection of its interior motive forces, and that through the partial media of Romish annalists, will prove that the presence of the Emperor was as much felt as that of the Lord, and that the purity of its creed was no less the result of Imperial influence than of spontaneous and unanimous conviction.

Baronius, the Romish historian, states (vol. iv. p. 325) that "Constantine brought it about that those who up to that time defended even the opinion of Arius, subscribed the holy rule of faith assenting to the Catholic doctrine." This was a most Erastian result. He further declares, however, that "As when the sons of God came to present themselves before the Lord, Satan was present among them, so verily, the devil was present in his members at the holy assembly of fathers; for that while they agreed

with Arius, they pretended to belong to the Catholic party, conforming themselves to the times."

In Dupin's 'Ecclesiastical History' we find an account of Councils that met in the fourth century. He states that in the year 322, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, held a council of nearly a hundred Egyptian bishops, who condemned Arius, the head of the Arian heresy. In the next year, Eusebius of Nicomedia, and the other bishops who protected Arius, held a council in Bithynia, wherein they declared Arius orthodox. In 324, Hosius held a council at Alexandria; he did what he could to reconcile men's minds, and not being able to compass his designs, would decide nothing. In 325, the Council of Nice was held, and decided in favour of orthodoxy. In 325, the Council of Tyre was held, at which there were sixty Eastern bishops; Athanasius, the author of the Athanasian Creed, came with forty Egyptian bishops, but he was forced to appear as a criminal, and the Synod pronounced against him a sentence of deposition. In 335, the Council of Jerusalem received Arius and his party, and were satisfied of his orthodoxy. In 338, Eusebius of Nicomedia (who had a mind to usurp the see of Alexandria), and the bishops of his party, being enemies to Paul because he was a defender of Athanasius, stirred up against him his priest Macedonius, who accused him of leading a life unbecoming the priesthood; and they presently assembled a Synod at Constantinople, wherein they deposed him, and chose in his room Eusebius of Nicomedia. In 340, a Council at Alexandria decided in favour of Athanasius. In 341, a Council at Rome, under Pope Julius, acquitted Athanasius; but the Eusebians, without waiting for this Synod, assembled oftentimes at Antioch, where they ordained one Gregory to fill the see of Alexandria, and sent him to seize upon it by main force; and

Athanasius, understanding what they had done, retired to Rome. In 341-2, a Council of ninety Eastern bishops was held at Antioch, who declared that they were not followers of Arius, but restored him, as they found his doctrines orthodox; and they made a confession of faith, which omitted the statement that Christ was "consubstantial" with the Father. In 341, another Council was held at Antioch, partly made up of the same bishops; and they complained that Pope Julius had taken into his communion Athanasius and Marcellus. In 345 came the Council of Antioch, which was orthodox. In 346, a Council was held at Cologne against Euphrates; of which the acts are forged. In 347, the Council of Sardica was attended by a hundred bishops from the West, and seventy-three from the East; those of the East declared they would not be present, unless St. Athanasius, Marcellus, and other bishops, who were condemned, were excluded from ecclesiastical communion; and the Western bishops refusing to accept of this condition, the Council was divided, and the Eastern bishops withdrew. The Eastern bishops then assembled at Philippopolis, and wrote a letter, which they dated from Sardica, addressed to all the bishops of the world, crying out against St. Athanasius and Marcellus of Ancyra, and making them pass for wicked rogues. In 341, the First Council of Sirmium was held against the heretic Photinus; this Council was orthodox. So also was the Second Council of Sirmium, held in 357, and consisting of Eastern bishops. In 353 came the Council of Arles, consisting of Western bishops, who were constrained by Valens, as well as the Pope's legates, to subscribe the condemnation of St. Athanasius; only a very few continued obstinate, and were banished. In 355, the Council of Milan met, consisting of nearly three hundred Western bishops, but few of them resisted the solici-

tations of the Emperor Valens to condemn Athanasius. In 356, Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, assembled a Council at Beziers, and used all his endeavours to make it receive the followers of Arius; St. Hilary opposed him stoutly, for which he and Rhodanius, Bishop of Toulouse, were banished. After he was forced away, the bishops of this Council, being devoted to the interests of Saturninus, did whatever he desired; but the other bishops of France would not communicate with him. In 357, the Second Council of Sirmium was held, and in this year the second creed of Sirmium was made in that city by Potamius, Bishop of Lisbon, in the presence of Valens, Ursacius, Germanius, and some other bishops; this creed was Arian, and in it they rejected the word *consubstantial*, and declared that the Father was greater than the Son. In 358, the Council of Antioch, under Eudoxius, Bishop of Antioch, condemned the term *consubstantial*. In the same year the Council of Ancyra condemned the heresy of Hosius; yet, at the end of their anathemas against his heretical dogmas, there is an anathema against those who say that the Father and Son are consubstantial or equal. In 359, the Third Council of Sirmium assembled, and appears to have been orthodox. In the same year, at the Council of Ariminum, three hundred of the four hundred bishops who attended at first, were orthodox, but were induced to subscribe a semi-Arian confession. At the Council of Seleucia, in the same year, there were a hundred and sixty bishops, of whom forty were Arians, and a hundred and five semi-Arians. In 360, in the Council of Constantinople, consisting of fifty bishops, the Creed of Ariminum was adopted, which rejected the term *substance*, as applied to Christ. In 361, the Synod of Antioch declared that the Son of God was not at all like his Father in substance, and that he

was created of nothing. The next six Councils appear to have been orthodox; they were those of Alexandria, in 362; of Italy, in 362; of Egypt, in 363; of Antioch, in the same year; and of Lampsacus, in 365. In 366, the Council of Sinyedanum consisted of Arian bishops. The bishops who were called semi-Arians assembled many Councils after the Synod of Lampsacus,—one at Smyrna, composed of the bishops of Asia, one in the province of Pamphylia, another in Isauria, another in Lycia; and the result seems to have been a reconciliation with the Church, though their letters are not extant. In 368, a Council was held through the Emperor Valens; the term *consubstantial* was rejected. Next came the Council of Rome under Damasus; when a synodical letter was written against the Arians. And in 381, the Council of Constantinople decreed orthodox doctrine.

The result is, that in the fourth century *nineteen Councils of the Church were orthodox and nineteen heretical*; in one nothing was settled on account of divisions, and in two, Athanasius (the orthodox) was condemned by imperial constraint. At Ariminum, though there were three hundred professedly orthodox to one hundred Arian members, the Council was constrained to adopt a heterodox creed; which subsequently, through fear of banishment, was subscribed by almost all the bishops, both in the East and West, until afterwards the same power which caused Arianism to triumph, adopted orthodoxy.

Have Councils, provincial, general, or Œcumenical, been contributions to the purity or peace of the Church? All the discussions which have taken place in the Protestant Church, notwithstanding occasional expressions of bitterness, much to be deplored, have been gentleness and quiet in comparison with the disorders and violence of antagonistic

councils in the Nicene age. Of this, however, we shall see a little more as we proceed.

That the faith and morals of the Church in this grand æra of Councils were at a very low ebb, is confirmed by the testimony of unexceptionable witnesses. Cyril of Jerusalem writes (Cat. 15, p. 209; Oxon. 1703), "Formerly, indeed, there were open heretics, but now the Church is *filled* with concealed heretics." Augustine (Enarr. in 41 Ps. Ben. Edit. Par. 1691), "When we see those who are the strength of the Church yielding for the most part to offences, does not the body of Christ say, An enemy is breaking my bones?" Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. Sec. sect. 26, 82. Ben. Ed. Par. 1778), says: "Nor do the people behave in one way, and the priest in another; but rather that saying seems to be wholly fulfilled, which was formerly uttered in reproach, The priest is become as the people." In his 43rd Oration, the same ancient Father speaks thus of the clergy: "But now there is a danger lest the order which is the holiest of all, should become the most *ridiculous* of all. For authority is not more obtained by virtue than by malice and wickedness; and the chairs belong, not to the most worthy, but to the most powerful." Eusebius (Lib. viii. Hist. c. 1) recites that "On account of the too great laxity of discipline men fell into effeminacy and slothfulness, envying and abusing one another, and only not making war upon each other with arms and spears in the place of words; the rulers opposing rulers, and the people disputing with the people." Basil says (Sophron. Epist. 172): "Because iniquity is multiplied, the love of many has waxed cold. For now nothing is so rare as to meet with a spiritual brother." Chrysostom (Advers. Oppugn. Vit. Mon. lib. iii. Ben. Edit. Par, 1839), gives the *most appalling* description of the wide-spread depravity of the

Greek Church, and truly remarks that it was wonderful that they had not experienced the fate of Sodom. We cannot *pollute* the eyes or ears of the reader with his narrative. Those, too, who should have checked these abominations, he describes as being too callous and corrupt to interpose; and he builds his defence of the solitary life of the recluses in the mountains, upon the impossibility of a young man's living like a Christian in the midst of the general depravity. "The tribunals," he says, "and the laws are of no use; nor are instructors, fathers, or teachers; some are corrupted by money, others only think of being paid what is due to them," &c.; and after describing the horrible wickedness which prevailed, he says: "If any have avoided these snares, they with difficulty avoid sharing the bad reputation, through those who reproach them with these things: —first, because they are *very few*, and for this reason may easily be hidden in the *multitude of the wicked;* secondly, because those wicked and detestable demons, when they cannot avenge themselves upon those who despise them in any other way, seek to injure them in that manner. . . . Wherefore, I have heard many say that they wondered that another shower of fire had not come down at this day, and that our city (Constantinople) had not suffered the fate of Sodom." Chrysostom complains of the general misconduct of the people, even during Divine service. (Chrys. in Epist. I. ad Cor. Hom. 36): "If any one would attempt or wishes to corrupt a woman, no place seems fitter to such a one than the church; and if anything is to be bought or sold, the church seems to be fitter for it than the market-place."

Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. ii. 80), speaks as follows:—"We observe the sins of others, not that we may grieve, but that we may reproach; not that we may heal, but that we may strike afresh, and that

110835

the wounds of our neighbours may be an excuse for our sins." And the things which we praise to-day we condemn to-morrow. "For it is not manners, but enmity or friendship which is the characteristic of good and evil. And the things which are deemed guilty by others are admired by us; and all things are readily pardoned to the impious, so magnanimous are we with respect to evil. But all things are become like the beginning, when as yet order was not, nor the good arrangement and form which now exist; but when everything, confused and anomalous, required the hand of power that should give them form. Or, if you will, as in a night engagement, and with the obscure rays of the moon, not distinguishing the faces of enemies or friends; or as in a sea fight and tempest, and in gusts of wind and in the boiling current, and the dashing of the waves and collision of ships, and the pushing of boat-hooks, and the voices of the commanders, and the groans of the falling, are uttering faint sounds, and perplexed, and having an opportunity for the display of bravery (alas! for the calamity), they fall upon each other, and are destroyed by each other. Nor do the people behave thus, and the priest differently, but now that appears clearly to be fulfilled which was formerly said in the curse—'The priest has become like the people.'" And again (Orat. xxi. 24): "For in truth the pastors have been foolish, according to what is written, 'And many pastors have laid waste my vineyard, they have brought disgrace upon my desired portion.' I mean the Church of God, which was collected with many labours and slaughters, both before and after Christ, and with the great sufferings themselves of God for us. For *with the exception of a few*, and those such as were overlooked on account of their insignificance, or who resisted through their virtue, who it was needful should be left as a seed

and root to Israel, that he should flourish again and revive through the influences of the Spirit, all yielded to the times; in this differing from each, that some did it sooner and some later, and that some were the champions and leaders of impiety, and others rank second, either shaken by fear, or led captive by profit, or ensnared by flattery, or circumvented by ignorance, which is the least of all."

To the same effect writes Basil (*de Spiritu Sancto*, c. xxx.): "But than what sea storm is this tempest of the Churches more fierce; in which every boundary of the Fathers has been moved, and every foundation and fortification of doctrine has been unsettled, all things are agitated and overthrown, having been raised upon a rotten foundation. Falling upon each other, we are overthrown by each other; and if your enemy does not first strike you, your friend wounds you; and if he should fall, being stricken, your fellow-soldier rises against you. We are in fellowship so far as to hate our adversaries in common; but when our enemies have disappeared, we immediately regard *each other* as enemies. On this account, who can enumerate the number of shipwrecks, either of those who sink from the attacks of enemies, or of those who go down from the hidden snares of their companions, or of others who perish from the unskilfulness of their leaders; since the Churches, with the men themselves, are destroyed by heretical snares, as it were by hidden rocks, and others of the enemies of the Lord's passion who have taken the helm, have made shipwreck as to their faith? A certain harsh clamour of those who are in collision through contention, and a confused shouting, and an indistinct sound from the never silent uproar of these about the true doctrine of righteousness, by enlarging or contracting it, has now filled almost the whole Church. For some are carried into Judaism, on account of the

confusion of the persons; and others to Gentilism, on account of the contraction of the natures; neither the Divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient to mediate between them, nor the apostolical traditions to decide their respective differences." And again (Epist. xcii. 2. An. 372): "For neither is one Church endangered, nor are two or three fallen into this dreadful storm. For the evil of this heresy feeds almost from the boundaries of Illyricum unto Thebais; and being deeply rooted by many who meanwhile have cultivated sedulously impiety, now it has sprouted forth those destructive fruits. For the doctrines of piety have been overthrown; the laws of the Churches have been confounded; the ambition of those who fear not the Lord has leaped into the highest stations; and the first seat henceforth is openly proposed as the reward of impiety; so that he *who has most shockingly blasphemed* is preferred as the people's bishop. Priestly gravity has departed; those who should feed the flock of the Lord with knowledge are wanting; the ambitious always consuming the money of the poor on their own enjoyment, or in the distribution of gifts. The accuracy of the canons is obscured; there is great liberty of sinning; for those who have attained power through human favour make a return for the grace of their favour in granting to those who sin all things that are pleasurable to them. The just judgment has perished; every one walks according to the desire of his own heart; wickedness is boundless; the people reject all advice; their rulers have no freedom of speech. On account of these things, unbelievers laugh, the weak in faith fluctuate. Faith is doubtful, ignorance overspreads souls, on account of those who craftily pervert the Word, imitating the truth. The mouths of the pious are silent; every blasphemous tongue is loosened; sacred things are profaned; the healthy among the people fly from the

houses of prayer as the schools of impiety, and in the deserts raise their hands with groans and tears to the Lord in heaven . . . . This is the most pitiable of all, that that part which appears to be healthy is divided in itself, and similar misfortunes apparently surround us with those which happened at Jerusalem at Vespasian's siege. For they were pressed at once with external war, and were consumed at the same time with the internal sedition of their own countrymen. But with us, in addition to the open war of the heretics, that also which has arisen among those who appear to be orthodox has brought the Churches to the extremity of weakness." And again (Letter 164, An. 374): "Scarcely *any part of the world* has escaped the conflagration of heresy."

The heresies of this period we find described in the Preface to the Council of Nice, translated from Arabian manuscripts, by Abrahamo Exchellenti: "Now such dissensions and discords had arisen among the faithful, that the perverse heretics were more numerous than the orthodox (*ut plures essent perversi hæretici quam orthodoxi*), and the adversaries daily increased, whilst the faithful diminished, so that they almost resembled corn in a most ample and fertile field of darnel. Nor did these abstain from persecuting the Church of God; but rather were worse than heretics, for in some places they altered the Scriptures, and in some places they added to them; in some places they expunged those passages which were least favourable to their doctrines, and substituted for the apostolical traditions and rejected decretals, other things of their own invention." Such things as these are not perpetrated in the nineteenth century; and therefore the transference of the state of the Nicene Church to the present age would surely be a calamity and a curse, and not a blessing.

You may be aware, also, that when one reasons

with Roman Catholics, or Tractarians, they cite what they call the long list of sects by which Protestant Christianity is disfigured; they tell you of Episcopalians, and Presbyterians, and Independents, and Wesleyans, and Huntingdonians, and Southcotians, and Ranters, and Jumpers, and others, whom they conjure up, for the excesses of one-half of whom Protestantism is not responsible. But for every one of the sects that have existed in the nineteenth century, I will produce two at least as rampant in the Nicene age. I will just run over a list of a few of them. There were—1. The Sabbatians; a sect so called from keeping the Jewish, in preference to the Christian Sabbath. 2. Simonites; from Simon Magus. 3. Marcionists; who held three gods. 4. Sophists; who held the transmigration of souls into beasts. 5. Manichæans; who held two principles, one good, and one evil. 6. Paulianists; who held one God, in substance and person, with three names. 7. Photinians; who held that the three Divine Persons were compounded; and, by their composition, united in one; if any one laughed, he was turned out. 8. Barbari; who were given to all sorts of iniquity. 9. Phocalites; who held all things to be unclean, and desired the Resurrection and Judgment to come. 10. Disanites; who held two gods, one good, one bad, and that neither good nor bad works were in a man's power: they opposed the Resurrection and Last Judgment. 11. Arians. 12. Eunomians; who were semi-Arians. 13. Macedonians; who denied the deity of the Holy Spirit. 14. Montanists; who gave a Divine honour to the Virgin, and held many other errors. 15. Timotheists; who only rejected the rich. 16. Novatians, or Cathari; who maintained that no repentance was accepted, after sin committed, whether great or small. And besides these sects, there were many others, of

seventy of whom Clemens has made mention in his Second Epistle. Such was the unity of the Nicene age.

Of the Councils of Seleucia and Constantinople, Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. xxi. 22), says: "The Council which was first held at Seleucia, a city of the holy and beautiful virgin Hecla, and afterwards at this great city, being the work of this power, caused them to be celebrated for the vilest things who hitherto were distinguished by the most honourable; whether we are to call that Council the Tower of Babel, which rightly divided the tongues (would that theirs had been divided, for there was a symphony in evil!), or whether we are to call it the Council of Caiaphas, in which Christ was condemned, or by whatever other name it is to be called, which overturned and confounded all things." The Council of Constantinople, and the state of the Church in general, are also fully described in the Benedictine Preface to the works of Gregory Nazianzen, in a passage which I proceed to quote. "Let us now relate who and what were the bishops whom Gregory disquiets in his verses, and what was the face of the whole Church. Theodosius the Great, having been purified in the sacred font by Ascholius, Bishop of Thessalonica, in the year 380, issued his golden edict to the people of the city of Constantinople, in which he enacted, that the heretics who should not embrace the faith which Pope Damascus, and Peter, Bishop of Alexandria, followed, should be judged and punished. Hence, then, were many bishops, of whom Gregory Nazianzen says: 'As to what regards the faith, they were prepared for either part, not observing the laws of God, but of the times.' Such bishops, who being *middle men* between the Arians and Catholics, set themselves to sale (*se venditabant*) to either party according to the times, being received by the Church with the honour and rank of the episcopal order and

dignity which they had obtained, now so augmented the number of wicked bishops, that sometimes even in Councils they prevailed over the good bishops. Hence those just complaints of Gregory, who could not restrain his zeal and indignation." Baronius, An. 381, speaking of the First General Council of Constantinople, says: "There were at hand many of those, who formerly in time of Valens, through the favour of the Arians, the orthodox being expelled, had accepted the vacant sees; for these, yielding to the times, under a Catholic emperor, presented themselves equally as the defenders of the Catholic Faith .... You understand, I think, of what sort, *with the exception of a few*, the bishops of the Eastern Church were then wont to be; how they were wont to have their faith changeable according to the fashion of the times, and only accommodated to private advantage; of which thing not only Gregory, but Basil in his writings is an abundant witness, as has been shown before in its place." Baronius might have added many other witnesses, chiefly Chrysostom and Jerome. There were many also of the orthodox bishops labouring under serious vices, of which the *least* was ignorance (which is itself indeed an evil), who, scarcely purged by baptism of their former sins, brought no virtues to the episcopal office. Concerning these Gregory thus speaks: "I am ashamed indeed to say in what manner our affairs are provided, but I will sing notwithstanding. Whereas we have been ordained and constituted the teachers of virtue, we are the workshop of all evil. A ruler is found in a moment, who has never governed anything before, and who comes as a novice to the dignity. Divine things are now like the cast of dice .... Yesterday discharging the office of an orator, you held law and right to be venal; but now you are suddenly made a judge and a Daniel ....

No one can change his garment so easily as you change your morals. Yesterday you were a Simon Magus, to-day a Simon Peter. Alas! too great celerity. Alas! instead of a little fox, thou hast come forth a lion."

With regard to the Council of Ephesus, hear what Dupin, a Roman Catholic, says in his 'Ecclesiastical History:' "There are several objections made against the nature of this Council, and the management of it. Some say it ought to be accounted no better than a tumultuous and rash assembly, where all things were carried by passion and noise, and not for an œcumenical assembly. . . The proceedings, in my judgment, seem to prove more clearly that St. Cyril and the bishops of his party were hurried by passion; that they greatly aimed at the condemnation of Nestorius, and were afraid of nothing more than of the coming of the Eastern bishops, for fear they should not be able to do what they pleased. For in their first session they cited Nestorius twice, read the testimonies of the Fathers, St. Cyril's letters, and the twelve chapters, Nestorius' writings; and all gave their judgments. Was ever any business concluded with so much haste? The least matter of this nature required a whole session. . . . The sentence which they caused to be delivered to Nestorius was made up of such words as discover the passion they were in: 'To Nestorius, another Judas.' . . . Was it not enough to condemn and depose him, but they insult over him with abusive words? Lastly, this Council was so far from bringing peace, that it brought nothing but trouble, divisions, and scandals into the Church of Christ. So that that may be said of this Council with a great deal more truth, which Gregory Nazianzen said of the Councils of his time, —'That he never saw an assembly of bishops that had a good and happy conclusion; that they always

increased the distemper rather than cured it; that the obstinate contests, and the ambition of overcoming and domineering, which ordinarily reigns among them, are prejudicial; and ordinarily those who are concerned to judge others are moved thereto by ill-will rather than by a design to restrain the faults of others.' This seems to agree with the Council of Ephesus, better than any other assembly of bishops."

The following is Dupin's account of the discord after the Council of Ephesus:—

"The conclusion of the Council did not at all conduce to the peace of the Church; but, on the contrary, the minds of men appeared more discontented than ever, and the Eastern bishops, who had the worst of it, sought to revenge themselves. On their return they wrote to Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra, against the letters of the bishops of the Council; at Tarsus, they confirmed what they had done, and deposed, not only Cyril and Memnon, but also six of the deputies of the Council of Ephesus,—Juvenales, bishop of Jerusalem; Flavian, bishop of Philippi; Ferinus, bishop of Cæsarea; Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra; Acacius, bishop of Meletene, and Enoptius, bishop of Ptolemais. Afterwards, having come into the East, they met again at Antioch, confirmed what they had done a second time, and from thence wrote to the emperor. . . . But as the party of Cyril was ill-used in the East, so those of the Nestorian party of the Eastern bishops met no better usage in Asia, Cappadocia, and Thracia. Maximian, chosen bishop of Constantinople, who began already to exercise his jurisdiction over the Churches of those dioceses, would have himself acknowledged by all the bishops, and deprived those who would not communicate with him. Ferinus, bishop of Cæsarea, came to Tyana, and ordained a bishop in the place of Eutherius; but

he, getting some help, forced him whom Ferinus had ordained to renounce his ordination. They also attempted to depose Dorotheus, metropolitan of Martianople, and ordain Saturninus in his place. They also strove to deprive Halladus, bishop of Tarsus. Finally, all places were full of deposed and exiled bishops, and the Church was in terrible trouble and confusion."

In Fleuris' 'Ecclesiastical History,' lib. xxvii., is an account of the false Council of Ephesus, as follows: "The bishops embrace the feet of Dioscorus, bishop of Alexandria, supplicating him not to depose Flavian, bishop of Constantinople. He caused the pro-consul to enter with a great multitude of soldiers, armed with swords, sticks, and chains. The bishops, constrained by force, for the most part signed a blank paper; Flavian was banished, but died a few days after, *of the kicks and other ill-treatment* which he had received, chiefly from Barsymas and his monks. . . . The one hundred and thirty bishops seemed to have been opposed, but not of a very meek spirit. . . . When they came to the last session, in the place when Eusebius of Doylée pressed Eutyches to confess two natures after the incarnation, and that Jesus Christ is consubstantial with us according to the flesh, the Council of Ephesus cried out: 'Take away and burn Eusebius; let him be burned alive; let him be cut in two: as he has divided, let him be divided!" And again: "In his place (Flavian's), and apparently after his death, they ordained Anatolius, deacon of Alexandria, bishop of Constantinople. Thus there was a schism in the Church: the bishops of Egypt, of Thrace, and Palestine, followed Dioscorus; those of Pontus and Asia followed those of the communion of Flavian: and this schism lasted till the death of the Emperor Theodosius."

The following letter of Athanasius and the Egyptian

bishops, detailing Arian outrages, is from 'Manse's Councils,' ii. p. 1164. An. 336: "We do not doubt that the news has reached you, of how many and what things we daily suffer from the heretics, and principally from the Arians, since we are persecuted by them to such a degree that we are even tired of our existence. For at the present time, when they suddenly and unexpectedly rushed in upon us and could not seize us,—who, according to the precept of the Lord, who says, 'If they persecute you in one city, fly unto another,'—had avoided them by flying lest the people should suffer; they have laid waste everything. For they have so devastated our property, that they neither have left us books, or clerical vestments, or any other utensils. Burning, moreover, our books, even to the very least, on account of the faithful representation of truth, and not leaving an iota of them, in contempt of ourselves and all Christians; they even burned the Nicene Synod, with which the clergy and the people were principally imbued." And the Synodical Letter of the Council of Alexandria, held in the year 339, is to the like effect: "We think that the things which they have dared to perpetrate at Alexandria cannot be unknown to you, since their report is spread throughout all lands. Swords were drawn against the sacred virgins and the brethren; whips were applied to those bodies which were precious to God; the feet of those who meditated chastity and all good works were lamed by the violence of stripes. Hence the crimes committed against them. The Gentile people stripped them, treated them contumeliously, threatened them with the altars and sacrifices of idols, &c. Among these things the virgins (were seen) to fly, the Gentiles to insult the Church, bishops walking about in the very houses where these things were perpetrated, to please whom (*in quorum gratiam*) wretched virgins

were compelled to meet drawn swords, all kinds of dangers, and every insult and injury. And they suffered these things, at the very time of the fast, from the guests of the bishops with whom they feasted within (*cum quibus convivium intus agitabant.*)" At the Council of Sardica also, it appears from Hilary's account of the deposition of the bishops (Fragm. Op. Hist. ii. c. 4) that "some showed the marks of swords, blows, and scars; others complained that they had been tortured by them by hunger: to these were added the stripping of virgins, the burning of churches and prisons for the ministers of God." The Arians retorted the same accusations upon the orthodox; and the seceding bishops protested: "By force, by slaughter, by wars, having ravaged the churches of the Alexandrians, and this by battles and Gentile slaughters, an immense multitude of all sorts of wicked and abandoned men, coming from Constantinople and Alexandria, had assembled at Sardica; men guilty of homicides, blood, slaughter, thefts, spoiling, and all sorts of wicked and sacrilegious crimes, who had broken the altars, set fire to the churches, &c., and had atrociously slain the wisest elders, deacons, and priests of God."

To take from a more modern writer an account of outrages at Constantinople, Milman, in his 'History of Christianity' (vol. iii. p. 12), writes thus: "At the death of Eusebius, the Athanasian party revived the claims of Paul, whom they asserted to have been canonically elected, and unjustly deprived of the see: the Arians supported Macædonius. The dispute spread from the church into the streets, from the clergy to the populace; blood was shed; the whole city was in arms, on one part or the other. The Emperor was at Antioch; he commanded Hermogenes, who was appointed to the command of the

cavalry in Thrace, to pass through Constantinople, and expel the intruder Paul. Hermogenes, at the head of his soldiery, advanced to force Paul from the church; the populace arose; the soldiers were repelled. The general took refuge in a house, which was instantly set on fire; the mangled body of Hermogenes was dragged through the street, and at length cast into the sea."

There were similar outrages at Rome, as we are informed in Platina's 'Life of Damasus: "But Damasus, when he was elected to assume the Pontificate, had the Deacon Uricinus for a rival in the Church, when many were killed on both sides in the church itself, since the matter was not only discussed by votes, but by force of arms."

It is stated in 'Manse's Councils' (vol. iii. p. 527): "But the Emperor (Theodosius) provided, by the most severe laws, that whoever dissented from the Nicene and Constantinople Symbol (of faith) should be deprived of their bishoprics, and not only should not be promoted by others, but should be driven from the Church, from the walls of the cities, and from the company of men."

The fourth Council of Constantinople, A.D. 869, decreed (Canon iii.), that the image of our Lord be adored with the same honour as the book of the holy Gospel.

The first Lateran Council, A.D. 1123, prohibits the marriage of the clergy.

The second Lateran Council, A.D. 1139, forbids the people to attend the ministrations of the married clergy.

The third Lateran Council (Canon xvi.), affirms that oaths contrary to the good of the Church are perjuries, and that corporal pains and penalties are to be inflicted on heretics.

The fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, is noto-

rious for its sanguinary edicts; and Constance, A.D. 1415, is infamous for its treachery and persecution of John Huss and Jerome of Prague.

In some of these Councils were Bishops who could not write, and Patriarchs who could not restrain their tempers within the bounds of ordinary decorum. Bribes secured majorities in some, and the sword of the Emperor reduced refractory minorities in others; some of them were called by contemporary Popes "dens of thieves;" and these Popes in turn were proclaimed by the Councils to be "infidels and simoniacal persons." The Council of Basil (1431 to 1443) is thus described by Joannes de Polemar, in a work written at the close of the Council: "*Si diabolus aliquid de Basiliensibus peteret, et contra fas et jus, dummodo illis vellet assentire facillime impetraret.*" The same Council describes Pope Eugenius IV. as *simoniacum, perjurum incorrigibilem schismaticum, a fide devium pertinacem hereticum,*" &c., &c. With these General Councils it is alleged by many Christ was specially present. They were infallible, says Dr. Manning; the voice of the Church, say others. Where, let us ask, is the evidence? In their teaching? It was generally corrupt and unscriptural; and even when it was true, it was as often the result of influence *ab extra* as the fruit of spontaneous conviction. In their fruits? Are violence and acrimonious disputes, and personal assaults, the tokens of a Divine presence? He must be ignorant of fact, or strangely blinded by prejudice, who can see in these any other succession than that of fallible men, or trace in most of them any presence higher and holier than that of this evil world.

Dr. Manning in his volume of Sermons on 'Ecclesiastical Subjects,' 1863, describes the Council of Trent as "a Council of Recapitulation," "the heir of all the definitions of the Church." "All those voices

spake by its one voice, as on the day of Pentecost all the Apostles spake by Peter." "It was a Council of Reformation—a Council of Reconstruction and of active charity."

It is really surprising that one accustomed to the light of truth in his former days, should become so blinded by superstition that he can see nothing of the real historic character of the Council of Trent. But after all, the best answer to the extravagant assertions of Dr. Manning will be found in the history of the Council given by Sarpi, Pallavicini, and Bungener, and in its own records.

The month of December, 1863, was the tercentenary of the close of this Council. The Roman Church accordingly then celebrated at Trent the conclusion of the memorable Council which derives its name from that place. No doubt all the pomp and splendour and ceremonial of which the Church of Rome is the unrivalled mistress, sheds such glory as it is on the tercentenary of so memorable an event. The Council of Trent regulates the discipline and stereotypes the doctrine of the Roman Church unalterably for ever. She may add new doctrines, as in the instance of the Immaculate Conception; but she may not, unless at the price of suicide, renounce a single dogma that the Council of Trent has passed into a decree or a canon. The assembling of this Council became a necessity—for it never was a choice—from the increasing popularity of the Reformation and the successive defections of some of the Papacy's most helpful national adherents. Though often called a *Deformation*, instead of a Reformation, it was really an attempt to reform many scandalous ecclesiastical and priestly corruptions which had made the Papacy a weakness in itself and a reproach over Europe. It was a response, such as it was, to the piteous cry of the Abbot of Clairvaux: "Who will give me this satis-

faction, ere I die, of seeing the Church in the condition she was in her early days?" Thousands of her own children were overwhelmed with sorrow at the spectacle of a Church assuming to be infallible in doctrine while grossly immoral in practice. Leo X. therefore felt that something must be done if he would arrest the progress of the Reformation or stave off a revolution! His first impression, that the smell of fire would silence the fearless monk of Germany, had been thoroughly disappointed. The *centum gravamina* were circulated in every city in Germany; and diet after diet, conference after conference, failed to satisfy the demands of the Reformers, or to arrest the spread of the Reformation. At length Pope Paul III. convened a General Council at Trent. By way of preface to his ecclesiastical reformation, he made his two grandsons—one sixteen years old, and the other fourteen—cardinals: and to his own son he gave the Dukedom of Parma, a portion of the property of the Church. Perhaps he thought it desirable, if not absolutely necessary, to provide for his sons, before the carrying out of the intended reform of abuses should make it an impossibility.

These and other shameful excesses did not shake the conviction of his subjects in Papal infallibility, but they created great indignation and disgust among officials by no means immaculate themselves. In the mass of the people, and among Protestants universally, these scandals aroused an opposition that eventually created a moral power which has grown in strength and numbers for three hundred years. It is a very curious fact, that the immoralities of a Church do more to upset its claims on the popular mind than its heresies. Pope Liberius, an Arian, had excommunicated Athanasius. Innocent X., when implored to condemn the Jansenists, replied: "It is no business of mine: I have never studied theology." There

had been *two*, occasionally *three*, and on one occasion *four* Popes contending for the Pontificate; one Infallible anathematizing another Infallible. But the common people got over all these inconsistencies, for mere logic does not very speedily reach the hearts or affect the consciences of the masses. But when, in the language of Cardinal Baronius, "infamous women placed their lovers in the chair of St. Peter, and monsters of licentiousness became Popes," and their illegitimate sons were provided for at the expense of the funds of the Church, indignation swelled into renunciation, and Protestant opposition shook the Papacy to its foundation. A glance at the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries will show that the reformation of the Church in some shape was demanded as a necessity. The Council of Trent was therefore held. However superficial or deceptive, it staved off the utter destruction of the Papacy.

The Council of Basil had denounced and deposed Pope Eugenius IV. as "a schismatic and heretic;" while Eugenius returned the compliment by denouncing the Council of Basil as "a den of robbers, at which the devils of the whole world had assembled." Sixtus IV. was implicated in the murder of Julian de Medici. Alexander VI. was a murderer. Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII. were deposed as "heretics and perjurers." Bzovius, in his 'Ecclesiastical Annals,' states that the Church, in 1411, had *three heads*—Benedict, Gregory, and Alexander. John XXIII. elected, according to Fleury, by bribery, was deposed by the Council of Constance on account of his immorality. Dupin gives a fearful picture of the Popes who filled the Roman See toward the end of the fifteenth century. He says: "*Thierri Borgia, neveu de Calliste, se fit elire a la place d'Innocent VIII. par brigues, par argent, et par promesses qu'il fit aux Cardinaux de leur donner des benefices et*

des terres, et prit le non d'Alexandre VI. Il deshonora sa dignité par son ambition, par son avarice, par ses cruantes et par ses debauches."

In the Council of Basil, 1435, *Concubinarii* was the common character of the priests, and all the punishment of a priest for living in concubinage was three months' deprivation of the fruits of his living. At the opening of the sixteenth century Fleury writes: "*Le crime etoit sur le trone et jamais peut etre ou n'a vu une plus monstrueuse corruption de mœurs surtout parmi les ecclesiastiques.*"

At the fifth Lateran, A.D. 1512, one of the orators declared before all: "*Vidimus rapinas, adulteria, incestus in sanctam naviculam impetum facere.*"

On March 13, 1545, two Cardinal Legates from Rome arrived at Trent, bearing two Papal bulls,—one for the Council to hear, in which they were appointed to preside, and another in reserve, authorising them to dissolve the Council should anything be done contrary to the dignity and rights of the Pope.

Four hundred seats were provided, and on March 14th there were just *three* Italian bishops to constitute a General Council. On the day of opening there were *twenty-five*, who rose to *seventy;* but on several occasions the number present was under *fifty*. Even in the third and last convocation, under Pius IV., *two hundred and fifty* was the highest number present. Pius IV. justly exclaimed, "What folly to have sent three score bishops from among the least qualified to a small city to decide so many things."

At the very outset of the debates, it was discussed whether they should call it a General Council. Even Pallavicini, who wrote his history of the Council to neutralize the too faithful history of Sarpi, says: "The title œcumenical will ill suit an assembly composed of so few bishops."

Some honest bishops in the Council proposed to begin with reforms of priestly morals first, and of doctrines next. The Pope's legates were alarmed at this, and carried the vote in favour of discussing doctrines first; and such and so great did they feel the danger thus got rid of, that they wrote back to Rome in ecstasy, "Glorious day for the apostolic See!"

Labbé and Cassart allege that in Session four, in which the Canon of Scripture was defined to include the Apocrypha, there were *three* Roman legates, *eight* archbishops, and *forty-three* bishops, or *fifty-four* in all! In the sixth Session, which defined Justification, there were *four* cardinals, *ten* archbishops, and *forty-seven* bishops, *sixty-one* in all. In the thirteenth Session, in which Transubstantiation was settled, there were *four* legates, *six* archbishops, *thirty-four* bishops, or *forty-four* in all. In the last Session were *seven* legates, *two* cardinals, *thirty-three* archbishops, and *two hundred and thirty-seven* bishops.

This so-called General Council, which defended doctrines which were heresies, and tenderly reformed scandalous immorality in the clergy, ended its work in December, 1563, by denouncing curses loud and deep on all who did not or should not receive its novelties. Such a Council in no sense represented Christendom. It is no more entitled to the name of a General Council than the Wesleyan Conference.

On Friday evening, December 3, 1563, the Council proceeded to read the decrees,—a work that lasted till Saturday morning. The legates, whose sole mission it was to guard the claims and pretensions of the Pope, contrived at the last hour to add an article which at an earlier day in the Session would have provoked a tremendous discussion. It was that whatever expressions and whatever clauses might have been inserted in the decrees, the Council meant

that it should not be and could not be interpreted in any case to the prejudice of the authority of the Holy See."

There followed the final vote on the petition to the Pope for confirmation. The members felt in this discussion that they were exposing the whole work of the Council to serious danger by petitioning one Infallible to authenticate another Infallible. If the decrees of the Council were fallible, the Pope could not make them infallible; but if infallible his seal could not make them more so. The advice of Hugh Buoncompagno, Bishop, and afterwards Cardinal, was accepted: "Confirm the decrees, but ordain that no one shall have the right or ought ever to entertain the thought of interpreting them." Pius IV. was delighted with this suggestion; and accordingly, on January 26th, 1564, he issued a solemn Bull, in which he says, "In virtue of the apostolic authority we prohibit all, whether ecclesiastics, of every rank whatsoever, or laymen, whatever be the authority with which they are invested, the former under pain of interdiction, the latter under pain of excommunication, to make on these decrees of the Council any commentaries, glosses, annotations, scholia, or interpretations whatsoever." This Church not only prohibits the interpretation of the Word of God, but the very dogmas she has substituted by infallible authority in the place of the Bible she also forbids her priests and people to interpret. She puts out the eyes of her adherents, and orders them to obey priests who themselves are also blind, and therefore "blind guides of the blind."

It was really necessary to append this prohibition, for in the only moment in which light shone upon it, namely, in 1546, the Council declared the Nicene Creed to be the "firm and only foundation against which the gates of hell shall not prevail," a state-

ment the modern champions of Rome denounce. This Council finally fulminated a string of curses against all that should refuse to accept its decrees.

Its last words were, "*Anathema cunctis hæreticis Anathema Anathema.*

Such a spirit and such teaching carry their own death sentence.

V.

INFALLIBLE POPES.

HAVING failed to discover Infallibility in Œcumenical and other Councils, let us read the lives, and dogmas, and pastorals of a few Popes, and see if we can detect any trace of the precious prerogative in them. In each Dr. Manning says this grand attribute exists. Surely there is proof of its existence.

In A.D. 449 we find two Popes elected, and the terrible war that ensued quelled only by an Arian king placing the one he preferred on the Papal throne. "*Multis enim pecuniâ corruptis, id perfecit imperator ut præter consuetudinem episcopus quidem eligeretur Romanus natione nomine Laurentius: Quorum gratia Romæ cædes, rapinæ et alia innumera mala perpetrantur.*" Baron. vol. vi. p. 532.

In A.D. 532 another contest was carried on for the Papal chair; when the sacred vessels were pledged, and the property of the Church sold, in order to raise money for the purchase of votes.

In A.D. 687 bribery again secured the tiara; and in A.D. 767 a layman passed through the orders of deacon, priest, and Pope in three hours.

In A.D. 896 Boniface VI. became Pope, a "man of scandalous life."

In A.D. 897 Pope Stephen succeeded. "He," says

Baronius, "disgraced the chair of Peter by a wicked and unheard-of sacrilege; he dug up the dead body of his predecessor, and having mutilated the corpse, sank it in the Tiber." "*Formosi venerandum cadaver effossum e sepulchro extractum, tanquam viventem hominem ad judicium adductum judicari voluit atque damnari et in pœnam tribus digitis amputatis in Tiberim demergi.*" Baron. Ecc. An. 897. Steph. Pap. VI.

In A.D. 904 Sergius III. was Pope—"the slave of every vice, and the most wicked of men." He was succeeded by his son, John XI., whom his mother elected; and he by John XII., who turned the Lateran into a den of wickedness and depravity, not exceeded by some of the scenes of the French Revolution! On this Baronius, the Romish historian, exclaims, "How foul was the face of the Roman Church, when abandoned women ruled at Rome, and false Pontiffs, their lovers, were intruded into the chair of Peter! Who can affirm that men, illegally intruded by wicked women of this sort, were Roman Pontiffs?"

Genebrard, in his 'Chronicles,' observes: "In nearly 150 years there were fifty Popes, who deserted wholly the virtue of their predecessors, being *apostate* rather than apostolical." "*A virtute majorum prorsus defecerunt apostatici potius quam apostolici.*" Genebr. Chron. A.D. 904. Paris, 1585. The same writer states (book iv. A.D. 1079), "The priests were of the most depraved morals."

Fleury writes of Gregory VII., "He excited cruel wars, which set fire to Germany and Italy. He introduced a schism into the Church." His haughty and unchristian treatment of the German Emperor is notorious.

Hildebert, Bishop of Mans, describes the Court of Rome in A.D. 1090 thus: "In the forum, they

are Scythians; in the chamber, vipers; at the banquet, buffoons; in their exactions, harpies."

Need we refer to the cruel and avaricious Boniface VIII. in 1303, of whom Dupin says: "*Il donna une autre Bulle, par laquelle il déclare que Dieu l'a établi sur les rois et sur les royaumes, pour arracher, pour détruire, pour dissiper.*"

Need we refer to the unclean and simoniacal Clement V., in 1314? or to Urban VI., in 1386, who murdered several of the Cardinals? or to John XXIII., who was charged at the Council of Constance with murder, atheism, and other crimes of infamous nature, and was deposed for his notorious simony and abandoned character? Need we name the nepotism of Sixtus IV., in 1475? This Pontiff instigated and approved a conspiracy against the Medici, the result of which was the murder of Giuliano de Medici in church at Mass; and on the excited and justly indignant Florentines avenging themselves by hanging the Archbishop of Pisa, one of the conspirators, he issued a Bull of excommunication against the Medici, and put Florence under an interdict. Need we name the scandalous life and flagrant licentiousness of Innocent VIII., in 1484, whose effort on his elevation was to add to the resources and rank of his seven illegitimate children? or the treachery, and cruelty, and lust of Alexander VI., whose death was hailed with unspeakable joy as a mercy vouchsafed to mankind? Were these the infallible successors of the Son of Man? Was the presence of Christ with a system which taught the assassin that the enriching of the priest was ample atonement for his crimes, and that the endowment of a monastery on a death-bed was the purchase of absolution for the villainy of a lifetime? Or in cathedrals and cloisters and convents, reared by the spoils of widows, and amid the protesting

tears of orphans? We might adduce abundant evidence that the people were scarcely superior to the Popes and priests? while the Bedes and Grossetêtes and Bradwardines—few and far between—only rendered the enveloping night more visible.

Now let us ask, and let every man's conscience solemnly and impartially reply,—Is there any evidence or probability that a Divine power and infallibility presided in the General Councils we have enumerated, or existed in the succession of Roman Pontiffs we have endeavoured to recapitulate? Was there any vestige of His presence with General Councils whose canons were the results of imperial power or ecclesiastical manœuvring? with the monks of the third and fourth century, who forged MSS., and perpetrated pious frauds on principle? Even the early Fathers were most defective. Tertullian preached the errors of Montanus; Origen denied the Deity and Personality of the Holy Spirit; Jerome praised the relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, and pronounced them endued with supernatural virtues, and capable of performing miraculous works. Athanasius, in writing the Life of the fanatic St. Anthony, commended it as a singular virtue that "his inner garment was haircloth, and his outer one of leather, which he kept till his death; neither cleansing his body from dirt with water, nor even washing his feet." Chrysostom declared it the special glory of St. James, that "such was his austerity that all his limbs died, and that, from continual prayer and intercourse with the pavement, his forehead became hardened as the knees of a camel."

Did Jerome, practising austerities in the desert, or Chrysostom, spending two years in a solitary cave, without sleep or lying down, and advocating the lawfulness of pious frauds,—or St. German, sleeping on a wooden bed amid ashes,—or St. Hilary, wearing

sackcloth and walking with naked feet,—give token of their belonging to a Divine institution under an infallible Pope? Can we detect any trace of infallible purity of character in Gregory the Great, grasping and ambitious, or any piety in his veneration of dead men's bones, and his idolatry of canonized saints? As soon might we trace it in the career of Mahomet, his more renowned cotemporary. Do we see any evidence of infallibility consecrating the deeds or inspiring the teaching of succeeding Pontiffs? Was Hildebrand in any sense a successor of Peter? Was the spirit of Christ in his proscriptions, penalties, and anathemas? Were the Borgias the children of Apostles? Did the Prince of Peace inspire Innocent III. in his crusade against the Albigenses? Were the footsteps of the merciful Jesus traceable in bloodshed? Was there any of the spirit of inspiration of the Son of God with the Inquisitor in his den, or with the Cardinal rejoicing at an *auto-da-fé?* or with the monk that carried the carbine in one hand and the crucifix in the other? or with the priest that made a guerilla weapon of the crucifix? —with the Church of Dominic, or the mission of Ignatius Loyola? or with the ferocious but accomplished Bossuet, while he eulogized the revocation of the Edict of Nantz?—"*Poussons jusqu'au ciel nos acclamations, et disons à ce nouveau Constantine, à ce nouveau Théodose, à ce nouveau Marcien, à ce nouveau Charlemagne, ce que les sixcent trent Peres dirent autre fois dans le Concile de Chalcedoine. Vous avez exterminé les hérétiques. Roi du ciel, conservez le roi de la terre—c'est le vœu des Eglises; c'est le vœu des Evêques.*" Such are Bossuet's sentiments in his Funeral Oration on Michel le Tellier, Chancellor of France in 1681, who contributed mainly to the revocation of the Edict of Nantz. Were the accents of mercy and truth audible in the Sicilian Vespers,

or in the tocsin of St. Bartholomew? Was Anathema! anathema! the last words of the bishops in the Council of Trent, the still small or infallible voice of Jesus?

I do not see the faintest ray of infallibility in those who loudly claimed it as exclusively their own. I do not see it in councils or canons, the fruits of fraud, or in Papal rescripts, that breathe out cruelty—in the blaze of burning fagots, or upon the floating banners of the monastic militia—in the worldly Charlemagne, in the fanatic Francis, in Nilus and Simeon the Stylite, and kindred ascetics, or in Bonaventure the idolater. I do not discover either the teaching, or the spirit, or the example of Jesus in royal palaces and archiepiscopal cathedrals, in marble columns, nor in Œcumenical Councils, nor in ecclesiastical decrees, nor in a proud and presumptuous hierarchy, nor in a Church, so called, which stood a barrier between the sinner and the Saviour, and, for the sons of God and the ministers of Jesus, had substituted a portentous incorporation of sacrificing priests.

There was the presence of earthen vessels only, from which the glory had utterly fled. The sacred vases of the sanctuary remained, but the Divine perfume had perished. Splendid architecture and gorgeous rites seem to have been the attempts of man to create a compensatory earthly glory for the departure of the glory of God. The shell indeed remained, but the living kernel had withered and died within it. The circumstances of Christianity survived, but the Divine life had fled; and superstitious priests and selfish Popes grasped the form more vigorously, as if conscious of its emptiness, and afraid it might collapse or be blown away.

Men rarely worship the robe who have the Divine wearer in the midst of them. They only begin to

idolize apostolic succession who have let go apostolic truth. They alone shout, "The Church, the Church, the Church of God are we!" who have renounced the Sun of Righteousness, and substituted the tapers of time; who have lost sight of the lodestars of heaven, and are left to grope their way by the guideposts of earth. Where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty and life; where the spirit of the Church is, there is slavery.

Of the Apostolic Churches themselves, we know as much of their failings as of their virtues—almost as much of their corruptions as of their faith and love. The rebukes of Jude and Peter indicate the enormity of the sins that nestled in their holy places. The all but entire apostasy of the Galatian Churches, and the Apocalyptic picture of the Asiatic Churches, testify that none of these were absolute models; and that the nearest, historically, to the person of Christ, were not the nearest, in spirit and truth, to the Divine model which exists in Him.

The lamentations of Tertullian (De Coronâ) over abounding degeneracy, and the descriptions given by Cyprian (De Discip. et Hab. Virginum), indicate the luxuriant growth of those sins which have entombed the African altars and temples in the same sands which cover all traces of the commercial grandeur and warlike glory of Carthage. Origen deplores the divisions of his day, as disgraceful to Christendom; Epiphanius enumerates seventy, and Augustine upwards of one hundred, new sects, who then tore and distracted the visible body of Christ—all under an infallible pontiff.

It is not succession to the Apostles in the same seat, but practical compliance with their inspired prescriptions, that forms the very essence of apostolic religion. They are not the true successors of St. Peter who cleave to the Church which Christ has left; but they

who cleave to Christ when the Church has left Him; for sometimes we must forsake the altar in order to follow the glory, and renounce the temple that we may retain allegiance to its God. Surely it is common sense to infer that the Lord of Glory is with them of every age, and name, and party, who live the life of Christ, and preach the doctrines of Apostles, and win souls to God; and it is neither uncharitable nor untrue to affirm that He is not with them, however loudly they may claim it, who have turned Christianity into an Eastern despotism, and its ministers into tyrants, and have petrified its living truths into cold and rigid formulas;—who rob us of the sabbaths of God, and give us instead the saints' days of man;—who make prayer a penance, not the privilege of sinners and the happiness of saints; who translate God's word into hieroglyphics, and claim a monopoly of interpretation;—who have turned the sacraments into pantomime, and have made man the slave of the ceremony, instead of making the ceremony a minister to man.

Rather would I believe that Christ was with flower or tree, or with anything that had life, than with these performers at a masquerade,—these dumb pall-bearers of a dead religion. Take away from our Father's house these incrustations of dogmatism, these drear icicles, these personations of the dead and dumb; and give us, O Lord, spiritual life of any kind, even in its excesses, living preachers and living men!

VI.

LYING WONDERS.

THE great boast of the Church of Rome, her miraculous power, is one of the brands of the predicted Apostasy.

In 2 Thessalonians ii. 9, we read that she advances πασῃ δυναμει και σημειοις και τερασι ψευδους, "signs and wonders of a lie," *i. e.* wrought to make a lie appear truth.

Dr. Newman, in his work entitled 'Present Position of Catholics in England,' writes, at page 284:—"I will take, then, one of those subjects of which I spoke in the opening of this lecture as offensive to Protestants, viz., our belief in the miracles wrought by the relics and the prayers of the saints, which has given both occasion and scope to so many reports and narratives to their honour, true, doubtful, or unfounded, in the Catholic Church. I suppose there is nothing which prejudices us more in the minds of Protestants of all classes than this belief. They inspect our churches or they attend to our devotions, or they hear our sermons, or they open our books, or they read paragraphs in the newspapers; and it is one and the same story—relics and miracles. Such a belief, such a claim, they consider a self-evident absurdity; they are too indignant even to laugh; they toss the book from them in the fulness of anger

and contempt, and they think it superfluous to make one remark in order to convict us of audacious imposture, and to fix upon us the brand of indelible shame. I shall show, then, that this strong feeling arises simply from their assumption of a first principle, which ought to be proved, if they would be honest reasoners, before it is used to our disadvantage. You observe, my brothers, we are now upon a question of controversy, in which the argument is not directly about fact. This is what I noticed at the opening of this lecture. We accuse our enemies of untruth in most cases; we do not accuse them, on the whole, of untruth here. I know it is very difficult for prejudice such as this to open its mouth at all without some misstatement or exaggeration; still, on the whole, they do bear true, not false witness in the matter of miracles. We do certainly abound, we are exuberant, we overflow with stories which cause our enemies, from no fault of ours, the keenest irritation, and kindle in them the most lively resentment against us. Certainly, the Catholic Church, from east to west, from north to south, is, according to our conceptions, hung with miracles. The store of relics is inexhaustible; they are multiplied through all lands, and each particle of each has in it at least a dormant, perhaps an energetic, virtue of supernatural operation. At Rome there is the True Cross, the Crib of Bethlehem, and the Chair of St. Peter; portions of the Crown of Thorns are kept at Paris; the Holy Coat is shown at Trèves; the Winding-sheet at Turin; at Monza, the iron Crown is formed out of a nail of the cross: and another nail is claimed for the Duomo of Milan; and pieces of our Lady's habit are to be seen in the Escurial. The Agnus Dei, blest medals, the Scapular, the cord of St. Francis, all are the medium of Divine manifestations and graces. Crucifixes have bowed the head to the suppliant, and Madonnas have bent their eyes upon assembled crowds. St. Janua-

rius's blood liquefies periodically at Naples, and St. Winifred's well is the scene of wonders even in an unbelieving country. Women are marked with the sacred stigmata; blood has flowed on Fridays from their five wounds, and their heads are crowned with a circle of lacerations. Relics are ever touching the sick, the diseased, the wounded, sometimes with no result at all, at other times with marked and undeniable efficacy. Who has not heard of the abundant favours gained by the intercession of the blessed Virgin, and of the marvellous consequences which have attended the invocation of St. Anthony of Padua? These phenomena are sometimes reported of saints in their lifetime, as well as after death, especially if they were evangelists or martyrs. The wild beasts crouched before their victims in the Roman amphitheatre; the axe-man was unable to sever St. Cecilia's head from her body; and St. Peter elicited a spring of water for his gaoler's baptism in the Mamertine. St. Francis Xavier turned salt water into fresh for five hundred travellers; St. Raymond was transported over the sea on his cloak; St. Andrew shone brightly in the dark; St. Scholastica gained by her prayers a pouring rain; St. Paul was fed by ravens; and St. Frances saw her guardian angel. I need not continue the catalogue; it is agreed on both sides: the two parties join issue over a fact; that fact is the claim of miracles on the part of the Catholic Church; it is the Protestants' charge, and it is our glory."

Then, at page 298, he says: "I think it impossible to withstand the evidence which is brought for the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius at Naples, and for the motion of the eyes of the pictures of the Madonna in the Roman States. I see no reason to doubt the material of the Lombard Crown at Monza; and I do not see why the Holy Coat at

Trèves may not have been what it professes to be. I firmly believe that portions of the True Cross are at Rome and elsewhere, that the Crib of Bethlehem is at Rome, and the bodies of St. Peter and St. Paul also. I believe that at Rome, too, lies St. Stephen, that St. Matthew lies at Salerno, and St. Andrew at Amalfi. I firmly believe that the relics of the saints are doing innumerable miracles and graces daily, and that it needs only for a Catholic to show devotion to any saint in order to receive special benefits from his intercession. I firmly believe that saints in their lifetime have before now raised the dead to life, crossed the sea without vessels, multiplied grain and bread, cured incurable diseases, and stopped the operation of the laws of the universe in a multitude of ways. Many men, when they hear an educated man so speak, will at once impute the avowal to insanity, or to an idiosyncracy, or to imbecility of mind, or to decrepitude of powers, or to fanaticism, or to hypocrisy. They have a right to say so, if they will; and we have a right to ask them why they do not say it of those who bow down before the mystery of mysteries, the Divine Incarnation. If they do not believe this, they are not yet Protestants; if they do, let them grant that He who has done the greater may do the less."

After this, Dr. Newman had a correspondence with the Bishop of Norwich, contained in a Roman Catholic periodical called the 'Rambler,' Part xlviii. for December, 1851, with remarks upon it by the Editor of the publication. I read at page 448: "First, let us suppose you" (the Bishop of Norwich) "to mean by 'credible,' antecedently probable, or *likely* (*verisimile*); and you will then accuse me of saying that the ecclesiastical miracles are as *likely* as those of Scripture. What is there extreme or disgusting in such a statement, whether you agree with it or not?

I certainly *do* think that the ecclesiastical miracles *are* as credible, in this sense, as the Scripture miracles; nay, more so, because they come after Scripture; and Scripture breaks (as it were) the ice." I may shortly state in connection with this point, before proceeding further, that if the Scripture miracles be true, and if they be the credentials of definite and Divine doctrines that we know therefore to be true, the miracles alleged to have been performed by the priests and others of the Church of Rome are the credentials of doctrines totally opposed to those of Scripture. Both categories of doctrine cannot be true. If, therefore, the miracles of Scripture be by God, and the doctrines they substantiate be from Him, then the alleged miracles of Rome must be impostures, deceptions, or mistakes, for the doctrines that they are adduced to authenticate are proved to be false. Both cannot be true—either the Scripture miracles or the Romish miracles must be false; because they authenticate doctrines which are antagonistic to each other. Omnipotence has become in Scripture the pedestal of truth, it cannot be in ecclesiastical history a pedestal of error. Dr. Newman proceeds to say: "Ecclesiastical miracles are *probable*, because Scripture miracles are *true*. As to the former of the two, I say, that if Protestants are surprised at my having no *difficulty* in believing ecclesiastical miracles, I have a right to ask them why they have no difficulty in believing the Incarnation." One is surprised at Dr. Newman's want of logical consistency here. He asserts that he believes the Incarnation to be true, because it is asserted on the infallible authority of an infallible historian; but he admits that the miracles of his Church are asserted, not upon the infallible testimony of infallible men, but upon the fallible testimony of fallible men: and therefore the Scripture miracles, on his

own showing, *must* be true; the Romish miracles, even at this stage, *may* be false. The Incarnation is worthy of God; it is the assertion of God. Dr. Newman's miracles are unworthy of man. He says: "Do you understand me to say that the ecclesiastical miracles come to us on as good *proof* or *grounds* as those of Scripture? If so, I answer distinctly, I have said no such thing anywhere. . . . . the whole of what I have said in my recent lecture comes to this—that Protestants are most inconsistent and one-sided in *refusing to go into the evidence* for ecclesiastical miracles, which, on the first blush of the matter, *are not stranger than those miracles of Scripture* which they happily profess to admit." Not a few impartial travellers have examined the evidence of one of the miracles he cites, namely, the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius. One would go to Naples at one's own expense, if allowed to bring a chemist, and get permission from the priests to submit to analysis the substance in the glass that liquefies, as alleged, periodically—and if the chemist testifies that it is what Dr. Newman asserts, and that it liquefies by no human process, by no skilful manipulation, but purely by a miraculous influence it changes its consistency, I will accept it. Dr. Newman complains that we will not go into evidence, whereas we wait to go into evidence.

Dr. Newman records certain miracles which must be facts, or they must be impositions, deceptions, and falsehoods,—one or other they must be. If not miracles, they are delusions or impostures. A miracle must be clear, unequivocal, and unmistakeable, or it is worthless. It is adduced, not as a truth, but as a witness to a truth. The miracles of Jesus are admitted by all; the fact that they were done is accepted by friend and foe. The Pharisees, indeed, tried to show that his miracles

were performed by Satanic power, but the fact of the miracles themselves they scarcely ever doubted, disputed, or questioned. Most of the Romish miracles are not admitted as miracles at all. They are singularly doubtful. It does not appear that God designed that the power of working miracles should continue as a permanent prerogative of his Church. But in this Dr. Newman may differ from us. In the Old Testament miracles occur in clusters. Some great epoch, crisis, or central era becomes the pillar, as it were, around which the miracles cluster, and at which they are specially displayed as proofs of the power, the presence, and the mission of God. Miracles in Scripture appear, therefore, on momentous occasions, sparingly, not profusely, clearly rare and ultimate appeals. They proclaim the advent of a king, the birth of Christ, the dawn of Christianity, the ministry of the Messiah, the mission of an apostle or a prophet. But in the Roman Catholic Church miracles come like showers of everyday fireworks; they are ready off-hand exhibitions, ceaseless coruscations, continually displaying themselves, and making the credulous stare, not sceptics believe. It is said of John the Baptist (John x. 41), that he did no miracle; but a Roman candidate for canonization could not be canonized unless he had done at least four miracles. Now, since it is stated that John the Baptist did no miracles, he would have met with considerable difficulty as a candidate for canonization. He at least presents a very remarkable and very suggestive contrast to the innumerable miracle-workers of every order of the Church of Rome who have been canonized. In fact, Roman Catholic saints radiate miracles; they speak miracles; they cannot stand up or sit down without miracles exploding in all directions;—wonders are their everyday doings. These saints seem, when one reads the process of canoniza-

tion—and I say it not as a piece of mere amusement, but as a conclusion fairly drawn from documentary evidence, which I shall submit to you,—like highly-charged jars of electricity: contact with the world at any point of time was the signal for an explosion of sparks and flashes, and wonderful miracles. In 1 Corinthians xiv. 22, it is said, "Signs are for them that believe not." They are a new phasis or development of the presence of God. Being convinced of the truth of the document, we need no more credentials. But now, "if they believe not Moses and the prophets, neither would they be persuaded if one rose from the dead." We have overpowering proofs; scepticism now is of the heart, not the head, and no miracle can cure it. I say sufficient and satisfactory evidence has been given of the truths of God's holy word. It is the clearest of all conclusions. Unbelief is the result of criminal ignorance, or of a lodgement in the heart, and not of insufficiency of evidence submitted to the judgment; and therefore it would not be removed by any force or splendour of miraculous power, but only by the operation of the Holy Spirit of God influencing the human heart through His revealed truth. Jesus demonstrated His Deity and His mission by showing irresistible supernatural proofs: they were conclusive. Miracles at such a crisis were to be expected, and the extant documentary and historic evidence of them is sufficient; in fact, both friend and foe are adducable as witnesses to them. But now that the Sun of Righteousness has emerged from below the horizon, it seems natural to our minds that miracles should be withdrawn, and that our attention, instead of being engaged in studying the credentials, the mere proofs, and witnesses who are outside, and whose testimony has been embodied in the verdict of all humanity, should be henceforth fixed upon the inner glory. We need not the cease-

less repetition or accumulation, and study of what is now beyond disproof. We need not additional evidence that the Bible is true; we need not to withdraw from the outer court and to enter the inner. We long to look within and be satisfied. We desire not any more diverting discussions outside; we are satisfied with the Divine origin and inspiration of Christianity; we would now enter into the holy place, gaze on the heavenly glory, and feed upon the living bread, which we know, and which we have seen demonstrated to be within. Hence continuous miracles, were such the case, would seem to me to tend to detain us constantly at the porch of the sacred temple, where we do not wish to tarry. We have found it; the temple rises before us in its grandeur; we have no doubt about it; we now desire to enter and walk amid its chambers, and listen to its eternal harmonies, and share in its bountiful provision. I have found the Book; miracles have proved it; omnipotent power is the pillar that upholds it. I cannot spend any longer time gathering additional credentials to prove that which is sufficiently proved; I want to open the Book, to read it, mark, learn, and inwardly digest it, and thus to grow thereby. The only still cumulative and ceaseless evidence of the Bible is within it. Its promises and prophecies, which are as lights in a dark place, before they are fulfilled, are daily passing into history, and in their brilliant transit reveal the inner inspiration.

It seems also impossible to compare the Scripture miracles with the Romish without an intuitive perception of the gross imposture and absurdity of the latter. They are often ludicrous, occasionally jesting, sometimes grotesque; whereas the Scripture miracles, in every instance, are solemn, awfully solemn. Archbishop Trench has referred to Tholuck's account of the two great pillars of Jesuitism,—Ignatius Loyola

and Francis Xavier. Loyola was canonized after two hundred miracles were believed to have been done by him; and so stupendous were the miracles of Ignatius Loyola, that he seems to have aspired to eclipse the miracles of our blessed Lord and Saviour. For instance, it is stated by Tholuck, as quoted by Trench, that Christ expelled demons by a word, Ignatius by a letter; Christ walked upon the sea once, Ignatius frequently in the atmosphere; Christ's countenance when upon Mount Tabor shone with supernatural lustre once, but Ignatius had only to enter a dark room, and it was instantly lighted up; Jesus raised three persons from the dead, but Ignatius raised hundreds from the dead. But go to the proof, says Tholuck, and what is the result? Ribadeneira, his companion and scholar, published a life of Ignatius in 1572, that is, fifteen years after his death, and a new edition, enriched with every available testimony, in 1587, that is, fifteen years after his death. Now, neither in the first nor second edition is there the record of any miracle performed by him. On the contrary, this biographer enters into an explanation of the reasons why it pleased God that so eminent a saint should have done no miracle. Is not this a strong presumptive proof that the miracles ascribed to him afterwards were invented for a purpose? They were, in short, pious frauds, "lying signs and wonders." But as soon as rumour spread that, for the glory of the Jesuits, it was desirable to canonize Ignatius, Ribadeneira sent forth a subsequent life, in which he gives an account of innumerable miracles done by Loyola.

Dr. Newman says, Romish miracles are antecedently as probable as the Scripture miracles; "nay, more so; because," he says, "they come after Scripture; and Scripture breaks (as it were) the ice." He says, "that the history of the ark at the Deluge is as

difficult to reason as a saint floating on his cloak." Now, Hume, the sceptic, says, that miracles antecedently are improbable. Dr. Newman seems to me practically to concur with him; for he says that the antecedent probability of Romish miracles depends upon the previous facts of the Scripture miracles "breaking the ice." But what previous miracles render those of Scripture antecedently probable? He makes the probability of one miracle depend on the fact of a previous miracle; he hangs Romish miracles upon Scripture miracles; but on what does he hang the Scripture miracles? what "broke the ice" for them? This is perilous, not to say sceptical logic.

The great miracles of Scripture, we allege first, were possible to God; secondly, they were necessitated, as we can see, by the peculiar crisis at which they occurred; thirdly, they were the subject of distinct prophecy, and they accomplished great and beneficent ends, which justified the suspension for a season of what are called the ordinary laws of nature. The floating of the ark upon the waters was justified by the necessity of the occasion. A seed was to be preserved from the universal Deluge; and as far as human means could go, God used them, and only at the point where such were useless, did he interpose miraculous power; and not only so, but this fact is recorded by an infallible pen. It is thus placed beyond cavil or suspicion. But what reason equal to this does Dr. Newman allege for the story of a saint floating on his cloak? What adequate occasion was there for such a fact? What crisis justified it? What necessity was there for so extraordinary and so hasty a transit? And besides these objections, when comparing it with Scripture miracles, there is another, arising from the fallibility of the narrator. It is singularly legendary—if not monkish. An ark floating with a crew in it is perfectly natural, easily under-

stood, very credible and reasonable; a saint sailing on his cloak is barely conceivable; at least, without some strong justifying crisis. The one seems to commend itself to one's mind the moment one reads it; the mind is instantly startled, if not amused, by the alleged occurrence of the other. But however improbable this exploit of Dr. Newman's waterproof saint may be, if there be competent and satisfactory evidence of it—if, as in the case of the ark—there is the testimony of God for it,—then there is an end of all dispute. But Dr. Newman says: "Protestants are most inconsistent and one-sided in *refusing to go into the evidence* for ecclesiastical miracles." Really it would require a lifetime to go into a tithe of the miracles reputed real in Rome. Dr. Newman asks, Why should a saint floating on his cloak be incredible? I answer, by saying, Why should it be credible? It is *primâ facie* absurd; we cannot discover a cause, an end, an occasion, a *dignus vindice nodus*. The onus of justification lies on him. But Dr. Newman must excuse us if we are very suspicious, for we are warned in God's Holy Word against "lying signs and wonders," as a characteristic of the "Man of Sin;" we are told that if we should hear an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel than that which we have received, we are to let him be anathēma; we are told that Satan may be transformed into an angel of light. This makes us suspicious; and Dr. Newman must forgive us if we hesitate before we receive as the credentials of God's truth, or the achievements of Omnipotence, the sort of miracles which he quotes. But still, let me add, notwithstanding this *primâ facie* incredibility, we are willing to go into the evidence of two or three of those he believes in. The more I study the miracles of Scripture, the more natural, credible, and necessary they seem. The more I investigate the eccle-

siastical or Romish miracles, the less credible, necessary, and antecedently probable they seem. If I go into the proofs of the Scripture miracles, I find the friends and foes of Jesus bearing witness to them. If I go into the proofs of the Romish miracles, I find that some monk, who had fasted and scourged himself to a skeleton, thought that he saw some remarkable vision, or tells us that he did some such exploit as the saints Dr. Newman alludes to; and, perhaps, a grandson of a monk relates his grandfather's secret. Besides, I am prepared with extracts from the highest Roman Catholic authorities, admitting the frauds and falsehoods put forward as prodigies and miracles. Dr. Newman is not ignorant that some of the most eminent members of his church, who justify his belief in the Romish miracles, admit that they were got up to increase the piety of the faithful, and not *bonâ fide* done. The great Bishop Butler, from whom quotations have been made so very freely on this subject, says most justly in his 'Analogy,' part ii. c. 7: "For simple things of this sort are easy to be accounted for after parties are formed, and have power in their hands; but before anything of this kind, for a few persons, and those of the lowest rank, all at once to bring over such great numbers to a new religion, and get it to be received upon the particular evidence of miracles—this is quite another thing." Let us see miracles where Romanism is not dominant, that is, just where they are required. Yet, strange enough, Romish miracles occur where Romanism is in the exclusive ascendant, rarely where an Argus-eyed hostile Protestant Church is supreme. Let Dr. Wiseman and Dr. Newman transport the Oratory from Birmingham to London, and let us see it on its journey as peasants saw the chapel of Loretto. Celsus, Porphyry, and Julian, the deadly foes of Christianity, living near the era of the Apostles, admit that our

Lord and the Twelve did miracles. I need not say that all the ancient fathers testify to the same thing. These miracles, thus recorded on unimpeachable testimony, were wrought to establish the Divine mission of those who did them, as in the case of Moses before Pharaoh, Elijah before the people halting between two opinions: and Jesus himself said, "The works that I do, they bear witness of me, that I came from God."

But I said that certain Romish divines give a very questionable support to the sentiments of Dr. Newman with regard to these alleged miracles. I give a few extracts from their writings. Tostatus, Bishop of Avila, a distinguished Roman Catholic writer, says:—

"A principio autem quando Aaron ministrare incepit nondum fuerit aliquis summus sacerdos, nec minor, qui sacrificia fecisset; ideo ut videretur ministerium istud a Deo approbatum, debuit in sua origine aliquo miraculo confirmari, quod fuit veniente igne a Domino ad cremandum sacrificia, consecrato et ministrante Aaron. Cum autem alii sacerdotes consecrabantur, erat jam confirmatum sacerdotale ministerium a principio in Aaron; ideo non oportebat, ut iterum approbaretur, in eis facto aliquo miraculo. Sic autem est de miraculis factis in lege nova; nam a principio in Ecclesia primitiva, ipsi qui convertebantur faciebant miracula, et in ipsa sua conversione apparebant aliqua signa, et super ipsos qui baptizabantur apparebat Spiritus Sanctus descedens in columbæ specie . . . .Nunc autem miracula non fiunt in conversis, nec Spiritus Sanctus descendere videtur super baptizatos, sicut tunc videbatur . . . . Causa enim est quoniam

"But from the beginning when Aaron began to minister there was no chief priest or inferior priest who could have performed sacrifices, therefore in order that that ministry might appear approved of God, it ought at its origin to have been confirmed by some miracle, which took place by fire coming from the Lord to burn the sacrifices, Aaron being consecrated and officiating. But when other priests were consecrated, the sacerdotal office was already confirmed from the begnning in Aaron, therefore it was not necessary that it should be again confirmed by any miracle. So it is with miracles in the new law." . . . .

"Now, however, miracles are not done among the converted, nor is the Holy Spirit seen to descend upon the baptized, as He was once seen."

in principio non erat fides evangelica consolidata in mentibus credentium. Sicut nunc, et pauci in Christum credebant. Ut ergo haberetur aliquid, per quod converteretur gens ad Christum" . . . . —Alph. Tostat. Comment. Levit. fol. 78, Venit. 1596.

And again, upon Matthew, ch. iii. 912, he says:—

"In nobis autem nullum miraculum petendum est ad credendum, et qui peteret incredulus diceretur, eo quod nos habemus jam causas manifestissimas ad credendum. etiam nullo miraculo apparente . . . . illicitum esset petere plura miracula! Cum unum miraculum ita probet sicut decem millia." . . . .— Id. Com. in Matt. fol. 164, Venet. 1596.

"Now the gift of miracles is neither profitable nor useful, because we have arguments enough to persuade us to believe without it. It would be unlawful to ask for additional miracles. Since one miracle proves as conclusively as ten thousand."

"Quæretur quare nunc prædicatores nostri, et prælati ecclesiæ, qui gerunt vicem Apostolorum, non faciunt talia miracula . . . ideo, Christus non dat illa dona, nisi quando sunt ecclesiæ necessaria, vel multum utilia: nunc vero potestas faciendi miracula in prædicatoribus fidei non est necessaria, nec ecclesiæ utilis, ideo non confertur. . . . Si autem sint pagani, possent miracula ae eorum conversionem proficere, non tamen concedit Christus omnibus prædicantibus inter infideles miracula facere; quod forte accidit ex demeritis eorum, vel nostris, qui indigni sumus ut temporibus nostris Deus tanta bona ecclesiæ concedat . . . Sed verius dicendum est hoc accidere, quia non est nunc necessaria conversio infidelium sicut in ecclesia primitiva, quando pauci erant. . . . . Si tamen Deus interdum judicat bonum esse ali quam gentem

"It may be asked, why our preachers and prelates, who are the successors of the Apostles, do no such miracles? . . Christ does not give those gifts unless when necessary to the Church, and very useful." . . . .

"If God judges it good that some nations should be converted

converti ad fidem, donat prædicatoribus virtutem faciendi miracula. . . . regulariter tamen non fit, quia non est. Nunc tam necessaria conversio infidelium, sicut olim."—Id. fol. 224, 225.

to the faith, He gives to the preachers the power of doing miracles, but ordinarily it does not happen because it is not."

Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, says in his answer to Luther, c. 10, s. 4:—

"Ceterum ut confirmetur illud quod dicimus . . . adjiciam exemplum aliud . . . Ego vero jam alia verba Christi producam, in quibus præter factum et mandatum, adjicitur et tertius, nempe promissio, nec tunc his diebus ullus ex eis effectus sequitur . . . . Convocatis autem Jesus duodecim dedit illis potestatem et auctoritatem super omnia demonia, et ut morbos sanarent. Ecce jussum. Jubetur enim apostolis, ut similia faciant, v. Marcum, c. xvi. . . . . promissiones videlicet, quam certe nullus his diebus effectus sortiri dilucide cernimus . . . Sed aiet forte quispiam, Inanis igitur erit promissio Christi? Nequaquam. Non enim voluit Christus promissionem hanc efficaciam habere perpetuam sed pro tempore nascentis et adolescentis Ecclesiæ. . . . enim in ipsis ecclesiæ primordiis, vere credentibus hæc facta sunt ad corroborandam Evangelii fidem. *At postquam* fuerat evangelica doctrina *per totum orbem diffusa, nihil deinceps opus* fuit ejusmodi miraculis."—Defensio Regiæ Assertionis contra Babylon. Capt., per Rev. Patr. Johan. Roff. Episcop. fol. 105, 106. Colon. 1525.

"For in the beginning of the Church these miracles were done by believers to confirm the faith of the Gospel. But after the evangelic doctrine was diffused over all the world there was no more need of such miracles."

Stillingfleet, in his able work, has adduced numerous proofs of miraculous frauds and impostures,

sanctioned and accepted as true by high authority in the Romish Church.

Many of the Romish miracles need not be attributed to fraud, they were many of them facts which seemed supernatural to ignorant monks and fanatics, but which, in the progress of education and under the influence of pure religion, are easily explicable phenomena. A dreamy imagination feeding on the fables of a superstitious era, and seeing things through its own hazy and distorting medium, magnified unusual into supernatural occurrences, and facts unaccountable to it into interpositions of a supernatural power. A somewhat parallel case is found in the unknown tongues professed by some of the followers of the late Edward Irving. I do not believe that these persons, professing to speak strange tongues, were wilful imposters. They lived in an atmosphere of fanaticism. Like Dr. Newman, they held there should be miracles in the Church, and so imposed upon their own minds that they believed their attempts succeeded in making the possible actual, and what should be, actually to be; and ultimately they imagined that the gibberish of an extreme excitement was the gift of speaking in unknown and miraculous tongues. We may thus, in the exercise of Christian charity, attribute many of the Romish miracles to guiltless delusion, ignorance, or mistake. And when the saintly exploits of one century were handed down to the monks of the next, or when the report of the wonderful occurrence in Rome passed over to France, Dr. Newman knows too well the expansive and cumulative force of tradition not to be aware that supposed supernatural deeds grow in portentousness by travelling, and would appear the more miraculous from the descriptions of the narrators. Thus, the ordinary was magnified into the extraordinary, the strange into the miraculous, and

the appetite grew as it was fed. We feel disposed to pity the blind credulity of mediæval monks, but we can scarcely extend the same indulgence to so well-read and talented a man as Dr. Newman.

But we cannot allow that all the narrators of Romish miracles were ignorant or deceived. High authorities in the Church of Rome confess that not a few were pious frauds, wilful impositions on the credulity of the people, in order, as pretended, to increase their piety. This is asserted by Ludovicus Vives.

"Nam quæ de iis sunt scripta præter pauca quædam, multis sunt commentis fœdata, dum qui scribit affectui suo indulget et non quæ egit divus, sed quæ ille egisse eum vellet, exponitur; ut vitam dictet animus scribentis non veritatis. Fuere qui magnæ pietatis loco ducerent mendacia pro religione confingere, quod et periculosum est ne veris adimatur fides propter falsa, et minime necessaria."—Lud. Vives. Opera, tom. i. p. 511. Basil, 1555.

"The lives of the saints are for the most part corrupted with abundance of lies, while the writer indulges his own passion, and sets down, not what the saint did, but what he would have him to do; so that in their lives we see the mind of the writer, and not the truth. For there were those who thought it a piece of piety to tell lies for religion, which is a very dangerous thing, lest the true be rejected on account of the false."

Now this is the testimony of one of Rome's illustrious friends. Melchior Canus, another Roman Catholic writer, well known to all who have attended to this controversy, does not hesitate to say:—

"Dolenter hoc dico potius quam contumeliose: multo a Laertio severius vitas Philosophorum scriptas quam a *Christianis* vitas sanctorum: longeque incorruptius et integrius Suetonium res Cæsarum exposuisse quam exposuerint Catholici, non res dico imperatorum, sed martyrum, virginum, et confessorum .... totamque eorum narrationem inventam esse, aut ad quæstum, aut ad errorem, quorum alterum fœdum est, alterum perniciosum. ... Mendaci quippe

"I grieve to state that the lives of the philosophers are more exactly written by Laertius than the lives of the saints by Christians; and Suetonius has narrated the acts of the Cæsars with greater honesty and integrity than the Catholics have done the acts of the martyrs, virgins, and confessors; and that all their narratives were got up for gain or out of mistake; in the one case disgraceful, in the other injurious.

hominibus, ne verum quidem credere solemus; . . . . Nec ego hic libri illius auctorem excuso, qui *Speculum Exemplorum* inscribitur; nec historiæ etiam ejus, quæ *Legenda Aurea* nominatur. . . . Nam et indulgent ingeniorum suorum voluptati, vulgoque interdum indulgent . . . . quod vulgus sentiebant non tantum ea facile miracula credere, sed impense etiam flagitare."—Melch. Can. Oper. tom. ii. pp. 164—112. Madrid, 1764.

They take great liberty to themselves, or yield often to the desires of the people, whom they found not only ready to believe these miracles, but fond and greedy of them. Therefore they reported some signs and miracles, not because they deliberately believed them themselves, but because they would not be wanting to the pious desire of the people."

"Quæ ego eadem de Beda atque Gregorio jure fortasse ac vere dicere possum. Quorum *ille* in historia Anglorum, *hic* in dialogis, quædam miracula scribunt vulgo jactata et credita, quæ hujus præsertim sæculi Aristarchi incerta esse censebunt."—Id. pp. 112, 113.

"Fratrem Franciscum Victoria, Lector optime . . . . solitum dicere audivi, postquam ab illius schola discessi, se ingenio meo quidem egregie delectari."—Id. p. 125.

Peter Damian says:—

"Nonnulli enim Deo se deferre existimant, si in extollendis sanctorum virtutibus mendacium fingant. Hi nimirum ignorantes Deum nostro non egere mendacio, relicta veritate."—Op. omn. P. Damiani Card. tom. ii. p. 206. Paris. 1743.

"There are some who think they honour God by making lies to extol the virtues of His saints."

"Nonnulli enim Deo se deferre existimant, si ad deferenda laudis ejus insignia, falsitatis argumenta componant, qui nimirum si egregii prædicatoris verba diligenter attenderent, talia

"Some think they honour God, if, in order to give Him praise, they draw up lying legends."

non sentirent." [1 Cor. iii.]—Id. p. 202 (Vit. S. Mauri).

"Quoniam qui vel Deum, vel Dei servum mirabile quid fecisse confingit, non modo fabricati præconii præmium non meretur, verum etiam adversus eum quem laudaverat falsum testimonium protulisse convincitur."—Id. p. 235 (Vit. Dom.).

John Gerson says:—

". . . . Respicit autem iste gradus, legendas, et miracula sanctorum, vitas patrum, visiones devotarum personarum, recitationes, et opiniones sacrorum doctorum; quæ omnia suscipit ecclesia et legi permittit; non quod determinet talia de necessitate salutis esse credenda, sed quia proficiunt ad commovendos affectus pios fidelium, et in ædificationibus ipsorum: dum in talibus nihil de certitudine scitur esse falsum, quamvis etiam nesciatur illud certitudinaliter esse verum quod oportet, nec ut tale credendum proponitur, ita, quod magis hic attenditur, id quam pia recognitione fieri potuit, quam illud quod factum est."—I. Gersonii Opera, tom. i. p. 416. Paris, 1606.

"These miracles are not proposed by the Church to be believed as necessary to salvation, but because they help to stir up the pious feelings of the faithful, and are for their edification, as things that might be done, than things that were done. And it is no matter if some things that are really false are piously believed, so that they be not believed as false, or known to be so at the time."

". . . Porro domus illa, in qua de Verbi incarnatione sanctissima Virgo cœlestem accepit nuntium, adhuc magno miraculo non tantum integra perseverat, sed Angelorum ministerio ab infidelium manibus vindicata, in Dalmatiam primum, inde in Italiam translata est; in agrum Lauretanum Piceni provinciæ; quod perinsigne ac nobilissimum vetustatis monumentum totus Christianus Catholicus orbis veneratur ac colit. Nec est quod quis de re gesta dubitet, qui me-

"Besides that house in which the most holy Virgin received the heavenly messenger of the incarnation is not only preserved whole by a great miracle, but was saved from the hands of the unbelieving by the ministry of angels, and was borne by them first to Dalmatia, then to Italy, at Loretto, which illustrious and noble monument of antiquity the whole Catholic world venerates and worships. Nor can there be any doubt in the mind of any that believe the angelic saying,

moria repetat illic dictum esse ab Angelo, non esse impossibile apud Deum omne verbum."—Baron. p. 33. Lucæ, 1738.

that nothing is impossible with God."

Lyra, quoted by Stillingfleet, complains "of the frauds used by the priests in the churches, to make the people believe that miracles were wrought."—In c. 14, Dan.

Cajetan also says:—"The argument drawn from modern miracles is only fit for old women."—Opusc. Tract. 10, de Concept. B. V. ad Leon. 10, c. 5.

Such is Roman Catholic testimony. John Launois, a Doctor of the Sorbonne, says:—"Instead of receiving thanks from many for laying open the fables and impostures of the monks, he was referred to Polybius, who determines that all allowance should be made for those writers who invent miracles and stories to keep up the devotion of the people. This I have been told by all sorts of men who pretended hereby to secure Christian piety.

"Nam ut quæ facta sunt, sic et quæ non facta, omnia divini numinis potestate metiuntur. Et quia quæ facta non sunt, fieri absolute possunt, perinde habent ac si facta essent, et qui non habent, eos calumniantur, et omnia sanctorum acta rejicere splendide mentiuntur. Ceterum quæ falsa est religio, Polybii documentis fuco et fallaciis indiget ad sui conservationem: quæ vera est religio, horum nihil exigit ut retineatur: quo simplicior est, purior ac sincerior illius apparatus, eo magnificentior et augustior. Corrumpitur, cum habet in se quicquam admistum dispar sui ac dissimile; cujusmodi sunt illa quæ sancti Patres, Concilia, veri Theologi admitti nolunt, admissa rescindi volunt.

"They judge of all things by the absoluteness of God's power, and regard not the things, whether done or not, as long as they might be done. A false religion stands in need of such cheats and tricks to support it; but true religion wants no such helps; the more simple, pure, and innocent it is, so much the greater and more glorious: it is corrupted when it has anything unlike itself mixed up with it." . . . .

Qui de Christiana religione aliter sentiunt, eam ignorant. Ex vera et falsa religione tertium nescio quid conflare instituunt."—Joann. Laun. Opusc. pp. 482, 483, Paris. 1660.

Launois was called the "Banisher of saints." "He has expelled," says Rose, "a greater number of saints from Paradise than ten Popes have canonized!"

Guibert, Abbot of Nogent in France, who lived in the beginning of the twelfth century, gives numerous instances of flagrant fraud. St. Piron, who, he says, got drunk and was drowned in a well, was worshipped, and great miracles ascribed to him. (Guibert, Abbas de Pignoribus Sanctorum, lib. i. c. 1; also Stillingfl. 2d Disc. on Popery, p. 600.) Now these, recollect, are testimonies taken from the writings of Roman Catholic divines, to which I might add many others, going directly in the teeth of the statements made by Dr. Newman, and proving, or at least alleging, that many of those miracles which he believes to be so precious, and considers it impossible to withstand the evidence of, were got up, as things that might be, not as things that were, not to prove the truth, but to promote the piety of the common people.

Let us turn to one of the alleged miracles, a very celebrated one, called the miracle of St. Januarius. Dr. Newman says, "Bring before the Protestant the largest mass of evidence and testimony in proof of the miraculous liquefaction of St. Januarius's blood at Naples; let him be urged by witnesses of the highest character, chemists of the first fame, circumstances the most favourable for the detection of imposture, coincidences and confirmations the most close, and minute, and indirect, he will not believe it." (Lect. on Cath., p. 288.) Dr. Newman has not stated what chemist has analysed the blood, nor has he given any reference to any document concerning

the results of that analysis; but he does insinuate, what I should be very glad to see, that there has been such an analysis. Canon Townsend's account of this miracle is as follows: "St. Januarius is said to have been a native of this city of Naples, and to have been Bishop of Beneventum. Three persons of influence in the Church having been arrested and imprisoned in Puzzuoli, by order of the Governor of Campania, in the year 305, were visited in their prison by the Bishop of Beneventum. For this offence, St. Januarius with his companions, after having been exposed to the wild beasts, which refused to touch them, were beheaded at Puzzuoli. His relics, his head, and some of his blood, were removed about a century afterwards to Naples. The intercession of the saint is reputed to have saved his native city from being destroyed by fire from Vesuvius. I desire, in those instances where the anti-papal writers impute wilful falsehood to the historians who relate the wonderful deeds of the saints, to quote only, or chiefly, from the Papal authors themselves, that my impartiality and freedom from prejudice may be known and evident. The blood of St. Januarius is preserved in a rich chapel, called the Treasury. Mr. Butler, in his 'Lives of the Saints,' imputes the preservation of Naples to the intercession of St. Januarius; and Baronius, the distinguished Papal historian, assures us that when the blood approaches the head, though at some distance from it, as if impatient of the delay of the resurrection, and conscious that it is near the fount from whence it sprung, and to which it is desirous to return, it ceases to remain in a solid state, and dissolves and bubbles up, to the great admiration of the spectators. Such is the testimony of Baronius, a cardinal, though not a saint, who is deemed by many to be deserving of every credit. Mr. Newmann, of

Berlin, on the contrary, an eminent chemist, is said to have performed the miracle of the liquefaction of indurated blood with all the circumstances of the Neapolitan experiment. In the following extract 'the P——' is understood to be the Prince of Salerno, a member of the royal family of Naples. The ceremony began with the mass. The P—— was not at the altar during this service. He keeps the key of the relics. It seemed to me to be a large golden key, richly adorned with emeralds and other jewels. The phial in which was the hardened blood was placed on the altar; the jewelled bust of St. Januarius, adorned with a most valuable diamond cross, the gift, I was told, of Christina, Queen of Spain, was placed next it. We distinctly saw a hard, solid, round, dark-red ball, as if of coagulated blood, move from side to side of a vessel which the archbishop held up to the people. The hardness continued. The prayers continued. The blood did not melt. A Litany was begun, in which the names of saints were repeated, and the people took up the chorus, 'Ora pro nobis.' The blood remained solid. The accounts given by so many writers I found to be correct. The people began to scream, to shout, and to raise their voices angrily louder and louder. A French lady, belonging to the P——'s party, was kneeling close to us, overpowered with emotion, and bathed in tears. She turned to Mrs. T., and said, 'Tell me, tell me, is the good God angry with us still?' She trembled with agitation. She impatiently called to her husband, who was at a distance, to come nearer. 'Venez ici, Henri; vous ne pouvez pas voir là;' but he did not move. The people still vociferated. The blood did not dissolve. It was nearly nine o'clock. The P—— took out his watch. He looked at the archbishop. Whether I am right in my opinion or conviction that he looked very significantly, and that the look was

returned with equal significance, I cannot so positively say that I could affirm it upon my oath; but the watch was taken out and a look given; and by the most marvellous coincidence—which renders it uncertain whether the sympathy of the blood towards the head, mentioned by Cardinal Baronius, or the chemical solution of Mr. Newmann of Berlin, was the cause of the liquefaction—the red solid mass did at that moment begin to melt. I had up to this instant seen the hard substance move from side to side, and I now saw the same substance gradually become liquid, and flow from side to side. The lady near us was mute with solemn delight. The screaming of the people ceased. The archbishop passed the glass phial, in which was the dissolved substance, to the privileged persons who had been admitted within the rails of the altar. The lady near us, with many others, kissed it with enthusiasm. It was presented to Mrs. Townsend, who put it from her, saying, 'No, No! Sono Protestante!' She could not believe as her neighbour evidently believed. The chemist Newmann would have been credited more than the theologian Baronius. It was taken from before her with a gesticulation which implied displeasure. It was placed before me. I could not kiss the phial. I looked at it steadfastly and earnestly. It was removed, I think, with another gesticulation, after a short pause, of surprise and anger. It was handed round to others, and I believe it was devoutly kissed by them all. When it was taken quite round the space within the rails, we found with the P—— of S——, that it was time to breakfast; and the same early performance of the miracle permitted us both to proceed to our meal. We left the church with feelings which I am sure are, and must be, common to many who declare themselves to be members of the Church of Rome. I will indulge in no exclama-

tions on the impossibility of believing the act we had witnessed to be indeed miraculous. I pass by all the thoughts that breathed my horror, and all the words that burned with indignation at the system which, taking away the Bible, and still claiming to be pure in its teaching, and Divine in its authority, affirms that the Almighty upholds, by useless, yet by ceaseless miracles, its unscriptural doctrines, and all its insupportable pretensions. I quote the words of the author of the 'Lives of the Saints,' the zealous defender and admirer of the Church of Rome: 'That the reputed miracles demand no other assent than that which is due to evidence on which they rest.' If the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius can be resolved into a chemical process, there can be no justification, as there is no necessity for the miracle."

A traveller writes from Naples: "When I was in Naples, in 1844, I witnessed the 'miracle' of the liquefaction of St. Januarius's blood. I expressed to the Marchese di Santa Capita, Intendente of the Royal Palace of the Caserta, and Royal Commissioner appointed to witness the miracle and to report the result to the King of Naples, my persuasion that the miracle was a fraud. He introduced me to the Principe Monte Robini, who had in some way or other the management of the ceremony, and the Prince asked me what experiment would satisfy me. I appointed the next day to give an answer (the miracle is repeated several days running). The Prince met me accordingly in the vestry, and again asked me what would satisfy me. I said, 'To dispense with the candle, and not to move the phial.' He replied that the Queen was there that day in state, but that probably he would be able to do it to-morrow.' I waited in the vestry till the ceremony was over, to know if the test would be applied the next day. The Prince came to me when the Queen was gone (the

miracle having been performed), and I asked him if I was to come. 'No,' he said, 'he had consulted the priests, and the experiment, if it gave satisfaction to *me*, would not satisfy the people' (*se la contenta lei, non contenterebbe el popolo*). I am certain of the words, and I have not the slightest doubt that he and the priests knew that the 'miracle' would be a failure. For any other particulars I refer you to my MS. Journal."

St. Januarius was martyred in the amphitheatre at Pozzuoli. A portion of his reputed blood is presented in a glass phial kept in the cathedral, under the altar of which his body is buried, his skull being contained in a glass case. On the glass containing the blood being brought near to the skull, the blood that was indurated before begins sooner or later to liquefy. One would expect that the eyes of the skull would wink, and the mouth open, because the skull is the natural seat of intelligence; but the miracle is the greater, inasmuch as the material blood melts, and the skull is utterly unaffected. Many of the families in Naples, too, are supposed to be relatives of the saint, and to have the blood of Januarius in their veins, and are called "Januarides;" and on any of them being introduced, the miracle is more speedily accomplished. In a work printed at Naples, containing a calendar of the saints whose offices are to be said in the City and Diocese of Naples, I find the following record of St. Januarius. It is entitled, —"Officia sanctorum patronum quæ recitanda sunt in civitate et diœcesi Neapolitana. Neapoli, 1721. Ex typographia Abatianâ."

"Beatus Januarius Præsul et Martyr inclytus extinxit impetum ignis, obturavit ora ferarum, et in occisione gladii pro Christo mortuus legitimi certaminis coronam accepit."—P. 24.

"St. Januarius, an illustrious Bishop and Martyr, extinguished the violence of fire, stopped the mouths of wild beasts, and being slain by the sword for Christ, received the crown of his lawful conflict."

"ORATIO:

"Deus, qui in translatione B. Januarii Martyris tui atque Pontificis, pretioso nos presidii tui pignore locupletasti, quæsumus ut ipso intercedente, populum tuum ab omnibus periculis eruas, ac de thesauris tuis divitias in nos ineffabilis misericordiæ benignus effundas. Per Christum."

"PRAYER:

"O God, who in the translation of thy Martyr and Pontiff St. Januarius, hast enriched us with the precious pledge of thine aid, we beseech thee through his intercession to deliver thy people from all dangers, and that out of thy treasures thou wouldst graciously pour upon us the treasures of ineffable mercy. Through Christ."

"SEXTA LECTIO.

"Vidit hunc sanguinem horruitque diabolus, recordatus est quippe alterius sanguinis Dominici. Propter illum sanguinem hic effluxit. Ex quo enim Domini latus apertum est, sexcenta deinde latera effossa contueris."

SIXTH LESSON.

"The devil saw that blood and trembled with horror, for he remembered that other blood of the Lord. . . . For from the time that the Lord's side was opened you beheld six hundred sides laid open."

Bishop Douglas also gives an account of the liquefaction of this blood, and proceeds to speculate upon it, saying, "The liquefaction of St. Januarius's blood, performed annually at Naples on the festival of that saint, as it is the most celebrated of all such miracles said to subsist in the Church, deserves to be taken notice of by me. Now, that a substance visibly dry and solid, having the appearance of coagulated blood, enclosed in a glass hermetically sealed, actually does melt while held by the priest in his hands, and brought near to the saint's head, which is placed on the altar, is a fact which thousands of spectators are witnesses to every year. But, however extraordinary this may seem, to suppose, as the Neapolitans do, that there is any miracle in the case, would be to make the experiments of the natural philosopher and the transmutations of the chemist deserve this name, as some of them are far more surprising than the liquefaction of this saint's pretended blood."—*Criterion* (Marsh's edit.), pp. 133—138. Addison, also, saw this alleged miracle, and calls it a "bungling imposture."

Before I proceed further with the analysis of this miracle, I may allude to the effigy of St. Januarius; for not only is his blood said to act miraculously, but his wooden effigy, as alleged, is inspired with, and has exhibited some of the virtues of the original miraculous efficacy. The following authorised account is taken from "Acta Sti Januarii Episcopi, &c., martyrum, Puteolis in Campania felice commentario et notationibus illustrata a Joanne Stiltingo, e societate Jesu, presbytero theologo. Antwerpiæ, 1757;" p. 148.

"Venerandæ statuæ quam ibidem haberi jam dixi, effigiem scalpro Neapolitano expressam exhibeo. Eruditi collectores, qui eam submiserunt, existimant antiquiorem esse geminâ aliâ Sancti effigie, inferius similiter exhibendâ. Observant autem hanc Puteolis summâ religione coli in cœnobio PP. Capuchinorum. . . . .

"Mira sunt quæ de naso PP. Capuchini nobis narraverunt, prout ea ab aliquot scriptoribus recentioribus conscripta sunt, sed nihil de his invenio apud antiquiores, nec apud præcipuores scriptores præteriti sæculi. *Horum sane silentium imitari mallem, si id bonâ omnium pace liceret*, quam de popularibus ejusmodi traditionibus plura dicere. Ne quis tamen conqueratur de mirabilibus istis, quæ in apologiâ quâdam anni 1714 operose defenduntur, nolle me curiosos lectores instruere, ex vitâ Hieronymi a S. Anna lib. iii. c. 4, transcribo verba tabellæ, quæ olim fuit appensa; 'De quâ scilicet statuâ illud admirandum antiquissimâ patrum traditione accepimus, quod reciso olim atque in mare projecto naso,

"I present an effigy of the venerable statue, which I have said is found there, carved by a Neapolitan. Learned collectors, who have inspected it, think it is older than another twin effigy of the holy man, likewise exhibited below. They observe that this one is worshipped with the highest veneration at Puteoli in the convent of the Capuchin fathers.

"The Capuchin fathers have related some miraculous things concerning his nose, according as they have been related by some recent writers; but I do not find anything concerning these among more ancient authors, nor among the principal writers of past times. *Certainly I should prefer rather to imitate their silence, were it lawful consistent with the pacification of all parties*, than to say more about these popular traditions. But that no one may complain that I am unwilling to teach the curious about these wonders, which in a certain apology of the year 1714 are laboriously defended, I transcribe from the life of Jérome, a S. Anna, book iii. chap. 4, the words of the tablet which was once hung up," (in a church of

alterum subinde substituentibus piis ac devotis viris, nullâ potuit unquam mixturâ adhærere, donec interjecto tempore intus piscatorum retia semel et iterum reperto naso, nec agnito, tertio demum pueri voce (an vaticinio) observatus, ubi primum capiti est applicatus, sine temperatura, sine ligamine, sine ferro aut alio quopiam artis instrumento, ita commissus' [qu. commixtus] 'est, ut non attractum vi, non ætate longâ fatiscat.'"

the Cœnobites,) "'Concerning which statue we have received this wonderful thing from the most ancient traditions of the Fathers, that the nose of the saint having been cut off and cast into the sea, on the pious and devout substituting another nose, they were unable by any mixture to make it adhere; till after an interval, the original nose, being once and again discovered in the fishermen's nets, and not recognised, but being noticed a third time by the voice of a boy, probably inspired, it was applied to the head, and without cement, or ligature, or iron, or any other artificial instrument, it was so consolidated to it that it yielded neither to force, nor length of time.'"

If the Jesuit doubts the alleged fact concerning St. Januarius's nose, as he does, it cannot be a very great offence in us, Protestants, to doubt the miracle of St. Januarius's blood. Both rest on the same evidence, and belong to the same category; and one wonders how any one, being unable to resist the evidence of the miraculous liquefaction of the blood, should be able to resist the evidence of so miraculous a nose—evidence which testifies that the artificial nose, made expressly for the statue of the saint, failed to adhere, as if very unsatisfactory to him, till the original nose was discovered, which, miraculously, and as if conscious of having found its lawful owner, clung to the face, and resisted all endeavours to tear it away. Medical men will thus learn that the Tallicotian operation was anticipated many centuries ago. This is not a Protestant, but a serious Roman Catholic narrative.

In reverting to the saint's blood, I would ask the following questions: Is the substance in the glass blood at all? To ascertain which I would propose to

submit it to chemical analysis. This is a sure test. It is easy of application. If blood, is it the blood of a human being? Bishop Burnett says that the blood of a duck was used at the Reformation for a similar purpose, and with similar pretensions in England. In the third place, if human blood, is it the blood of the said Januarius, and of no one else? Fourthly, does it liquefy by a miracle? or by the application of heat? or by a chemical process? or by other priestly manipulation? And, lastly, the exploit is so easily done, that strong proof seems to be required to lead one to accept it as a miraculous phænomenon.

The Scripture miracles are most of them the pedestals of glorious truths, or the signs and seals of a Divine mission, needing, from its novelty, the force of such credentials; but what truth does the liquefaction of the blood of St. Januarius attest? What holy or confiding emotions does it awaken? Does it mean to prove that we ought to invocate St. Januarius as a saint, and give him such worship as is given to Romish saints? If so, showers of miracles, far more stupendous in aspect than anything of this kind, would never convince us that a man is to be invocated as a *δαίμων*, so long as one recorded text in its own majestic accents proclaims, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." No manifestation of power is equal to upset a declaration of God's truth. Deeds of the greatest power must fall before the testimony of a single inspired declaration—"Thus saith the Lord." Were an angel from heaven to appear radiant with the ineffable splendours of the blessed, and were he to raise a dead man by his word, and tell me that he did so in order to induce me to believe in purgatory, transubstantiation, or the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass, I would instantly re-

collect, while I beheld the miracle, that "some shall do such wonders, that if it were possible, they should deceive the very elect;" and I would also recollect that "Satan himself is transformed into an angel of light;" and I would say to such a miracle-worker come to earth to corroborate such a doctrine, "Get thee behind me, Satan; thou savourest not of the things that be of God." The whole story of St. Januarius is not an innocent device, or a credulous belief; it is a priestly fraud, a "lying wonder;" it is an attempt to stamp on the currency of Antichrist the awful Name and Image and Superscription of Jesus.

I proceed to present illustrative extracts from authentic documents—the Breviary, and the Acta Sanctorum. I will submit ecclesiastical or Romish miracles, related on what is the highest ecclesiastical authority. The first list I will give is that of the miracles performed by Sta. Rosa of Lima, who was canonized by Pope Clement X. in the year 1761. We are informed, in the Romish Breviary, read by every priest, *Pars Æstiva, Festa Augusti*, August 30th, that she owed her name to her face when an infant having been wonderfully transfigured into the appearance of a rose. "Nam vultus infantis mirabiliter in rosæ effigiem transfiguratus, huic nomini occasionem dedit, cui Virgo Deipara cognomen adjecit, jubens vocari deinceps Rosam a Sancta Maria."

The source from which I quote is the 'Codex constitutionum quas Summi Pontifices ediderunt in solemni Canonizatione Sanctorum a Johanne XV. ad Benedictum XIII., sive ab A. D. 993 ad A. D. 1729, accurante Justo Fontanino, Archiepiscopo Ancyrano. Romæ, 1729. Ex typographia Reverendæ Cameræ Apostolicæ.—Imprimatur si videbitur Reverendissimo Patri Sacri Palatii magistro. N. Baccarius Episc. Pojan. Vicesg.—Imprimatur. Fr. Jo. Benedictus

Zuanelli ordinis prædicatorum, Sacri Palatii Apostolici Magister."

"Clemens Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam."—P. 402, an. 1671.

"Cœlestis paterfamilias, &c."

"Hinc si deprehenderet de virtutibus se tantillum commendari, cruciabatur misera, expallescebat, diffluebat lacrymis, dehiscebat illico, se mergere in abyssum humilitatis. Accidit, quod e vicino ædium conclavi obiter audiret personas graves de Rosæ, tanquam absentis, mirabili vitâ honorifice ac secrete confabulantes. Expavit et contremuit exsanguis virgo, angore, fletu, et mœrore contabuit, ac seipsam durissime objurgans, ter, quater illisit pugnum aculeatæ capitis sui coronæ. Fluxerunt sub velo sanguinis rivi, ut acrimonia doloris ingratissimum alienæ laudis obtunderet auditum."—P. 405.

"Erga imagines beatissimæ Virginis miro fervebat devotionis affectu, et maxime circa eam, quæ augustissimam Rosarii Reginam exprimit, in cujus sacello habitum sui ordinis suscipiens, ploranti Matri visa fuit blando favore Deiparæ in cœlum elevari."—P. 415.

"Adstitit etiam sæpe Regina cœli a dexteris ejus, ita ut ab

"Clement, Bishop, servant of servants, in perpetual memory of the thing."

"Hence, if she detected any one praising her ever so little for her virtues, she being grieved at it, would torment herself, become very pale, overflow with tears, and would on the very spot almost split with misery, and cast herself into the very depths of humility. As she was on her way one day, she approached the vicinity of the buildings of the conclave, and she heard some grave persons talking to themselves in praise of the wonderful life of Rosa, supposing she was not within hearing. The virgin was exceedingly frightened, and trembled with horror; she pined away with terror, weeping with grief, and rebuking herself very severely, she struck three or four times with her fist the crown of thorns on her head. Streams of blood flowed under her veil, so that the force of her sorrow might weaken the unwelcome sound, hearing another's praise of herself."—P. 405.

"She was burning with wonderful love in her devotions before the images of the blessed Virgin, and chiefly around that which represents the most august queen of the Rosary, in whose chapel, wearing the dress of her order, she appeared to the weeping mother, by the kind favour of the Mother of God, raised toward the sky."—P. 415.

"The Queen of Heaven often also stood near to her right hand

undecimo ætatis suæ anno usque ad extremum non defuerit ei hoc pretiosum familiaritatis contubernium. In Rosariano enim Sacello ex sedulo ministerio mutua cum illa erat ei conversatio, eoque honore hanc suam famulam dignata est, ut cubiculariæ ipsi exhibuerit ministeria, excitando eam illis vocibus;—'Surge ad orationem, filia, surge, nam instat hora.' Illique experrectæ se præbebat videndam facie ad faciem, majestate decoram, et gloriæ cœlestis Paradisum, exclamanti cum alterâ Elizabeth, 'Unde hoc mihi, ut veniat Mater Domini mei ad me.'"—Ibid.

so that from the twelfth year of her age to her last moment she never wanted this precious familiar companionship. Also, on account of her laborious services, she conversed with her in the Chapel of the Rosary, and she deemed this her servant so worthy of this honour, that she exhibited her services to the chamber attendant herself, whilst she was animating Rosa with these words: 'Arise to prayer, my daughter, arise, for the time is at hand.' And the Virgin showed herself to St. Rosa, on rising face to face, beautiful in majesty, and a Paradise of heavenly glory, and St. Rosa exclaimed, like another Elizabeth, 'Whence does this happen to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?'"

Her intercourse with the Saviour was frequent, and on one occasion, we are told in the Roman Breviary that she deserved to hear from Christ the words, "Rose of my heart, be thou my bride." (Brev. Pars Æstiva; Festa Augusti, 30th August.) "A Christo has voces audire meruit, 'Rosa cordis mei, tu mihi sponsa esto.'" In her Bull of canonization, p. 409, we learn:—

"Inde enim amoris ignes in corde sentiebat, ut ipse Jesu sæpe amanti Rosæ in paginæ planitie apparuit, eique suavi obtutu blandiebatur, ut verbum attenta lectione talis animæ dignissimum, in quo sunt omnes thesauri sapientiæ et scientiæ Dei; sic etiam cum occuparetur in telæ consuturâ, pulvillo ipsius sæpe quietissime insidebat, et ad cor hujus dilectæ tacitis nutubus loquebatur, omnique gestu divinum protestabatur amorem."

"Afterwards, too, she felt the fires of love were so powerfully in her heart, that Jesus himself often appeared to the loving Rosa in the page of her book, and encouraged her with such a sweet look, that the word of such a soul is most worthy of attentive perusal, in which are all the treasures of the wisdom and knowledge of God; so also when she was occupied at her needlework, Christ often quietly sat upon the cushion, and spoke to the heart of this beloved one

"Ab innocentibus virginibus visi est cum ipso Jesu sistere, quandoque etiam deambulare, et secretissima miscere colloquia tali cum majestate, ut quocunque pedem fixissit ille, pavimentum fulgenti lumine splenderet, utque talis Rosa nulli alteri plantæ adhæreret, quantum ei, 'qui est flos campi, et lilium convallium.'"—P. 411.

with silent nods, and with every gesture openly declared His divine love."

"She was also seen by innocent virgins to tarry with Jesus himself, and sometimes even to walk about with Him, and to hold secret conversation with Him with such majesty that wherever He placed his foot the pavement shone with a splendid light, so that such a Rose clang to no other plant, but to Him 'who is the flower of the field, and the lily of the valley.'"

These are Romish miracles, not described by Protestants, or by individual or obscure monks, but by the highest Roman Catholic authority, which every prelate has in his possession, and to which I refer them. I ask, Are they as credible as the miracles recorded in the Word of God? Are they possible? No: for blasphemy cannot have the sanction of God.

Here is another part of her miraculous history:—

"Languens et æstuans divini amoris ignibus, in nocte orans visa fuit ab aliâ virgine magnis luminibus coruscans veluti igniculis per os oculosque evibratis, protestantibus quantum incendium intus ferveret, quod aliis pluries eâ inscià coram diversis contigisse innotuit."—P. 413.

"Languishing and burning with the fires of Divine love, she was seen, whilst praying in the night time, by one of the other virgins, *glittering with great lights, like small sparkles of fire, vibrating over her mouth and eyes, showing forth with what force the internal fire burned*, which was publicly known to have happened to many others, who were at the time unconscious of it, in the presence of different persons."

These great authorities say, you see, that such was the intensity of her inner divine love, that it exploded in sparks of light from her eyes and mouth.

How can Archbishop Manning accept such puerilities as proofs of Divine power?

"Alias in mentis excessu adfuit illi parvulus Jesus, purissimæ genetricis ulnis innixus, eamque blande alloquens, jussit sparsas per solum Rosas in sinuosæ vestis laciniam colligere. Inde divinus infans unâ petitâ et gratianter acceptâ subintulit, 'Hæc Rosa tu es, hujus providam curam mihi assumo, tu de reliquis, ut magis volueris, disponito.' His agnovit se teneri in dexterâ Salvatoris velut Rosam electam, quam non raperet quisquam de manu ejus. De reliquis rosis subitaneum sertum contexens, tremendo Jesu capiti imposuit, qui Virgini arridens eamque benedicens disparuit. Cæteris rosis indicari novit pias Virgines Limenses, quas post suum obitum in novellum Sanctæ Catharinæ Senensis monasterium colligi oportebat."—P. 418.

"At another time, when her mind was abstracted, Jesus, as a little child, leaning upon his most pure mother's arms, came to her, and softly addressing her, ordered her to collect into the folds of her garments the roses which were scattered on the ground. Thence the Divine infant having sought and graciously accepted one of them, He added, 'Thou art this rose. I take upon myself the care of this: dispose of the rest as you will.' She learnt from these words that she was held in the right hand of the Saviour as an elect Rose, which no one should ever pluck from his hand. Twisting a hasty wreath with the rest of the roses, she placed it on the tremendous head of Jesus, who, smiling on the Virgin, and blessing her, disappeared. She knew that by the other roses were indicated the pious Virgins of Lima, whom it was necessary to gather after her death into the new convent of St. Catharine of Sienna."

In the next place, she frequently strove with devils, as will appear from the following:—

"Luctabatur enim quam frequentissime cum dæmonibus, multisque illorum molestiis vexabatur, ex quibus sub tetrâ specie molossi unus eam orantem latratu horrisono terrere, et rabido morsu per solum illam raptans tentavit discerpere, donec clamavit ad sponsum, 'Ne tradas bestiis animas confitentes tibi.' Alias colaphum impegit, quandoque saxum rude

"She frequently strove with devils, being much annoyed by them, of whom one in the form of a black mastiff tried to terrify her, when she was praying, by his horrisonous barking; and he tried to tear her in pieces with his savage teeth, as he dragged her along the floor, until she cried to the Bridegroom, 'Deliver not the souls of those who confess thee, to

in eam librnvit, quod solo tenus Rosam nec læsam nec territam prostravit. Libros ejus spirituales laceravit," &c.—P. 412.

the beast.' At another time the devil gave her a box on the ear, and once he hurled a great stone at her, which nearly threw her, neither hurt nor terrified, to the ground. He also tore her spiritual books," &c.

These are ecclesiastical miracles which Dr. Newman says are antecedently as credible as the miracles in the Word of God. Is the reverend father serious? or was he ignorant of these things? It is said, in the next place:—

"Prope obitum per Quadragesimam cum aviculâ mire canorâ, quæ sole occiduo ante suum cubiculum advolabat, alternavit Rosa cantica et laudes Dei quotidie per horam integram tanto ordine, ut canente aviculâ virgo sileret, et virgine modulante, avicula attentissima nec pipiret. Quin et ipsas insensibiles plantas exemplo prorsus singulari ad laudes et ad orationem Dei, eo versiculo prolato, 'Benedicite universa germinantia in terra Domino,' invitavit, et visibiliter sic inclinavit, ut arborum summitates terram attingerent, veluti solemni venerationis ritu Creatorem suum adorarent; usque adeo verum est, quod is, qui adhæret Domino, unus Spiritus est, et ei quod obediant omnia."—P. 410.

"Rosa daily sang throughout Lent the praises of God for a whole hour, alternately with a most tuneful bird, which flew before her chamber at sunset; and with such regularity that the virgin was silent whilst the bird sang, and whilst she was making melody, the very attentive bird did not interrupt her. And when she invoked the insensible plants to praise God, when she uttered the verse, 'Let all things budding upon the earth praise the Lord,' they bent so visibly, that the tops of the trees touched the earth, as if they adored their Creator with solemn veneration; so true is it, that he who keeps close to the Lord, is one Spirit, and all things obey him."

"Interea Limam pervenere hujus Sanctæ sedis Apostolicæ, ut ex formulâ, a congregatione Rituum præscriptâ, examinarentur testes de vitâ et gestis hujus ancillæ Dei: quod cœptum anno Domini millesimo sexcentesimo tricesimo, ob multitudinem testium, qui fuere numero centum octoginta tres, non potuit

'In the meantime, they of the Holy Apostolical See came to Lima, in order that, according to the form of the Ritual prescribed by the congregation, witnesses might be examined as to the life and acts of this handmaid of God; which began in the year of the Lord 1630, and on account of the great number

absolvi, nisi in mense Maio, anno millesimo sexcentesimo tricesimo secundo. Fuere pro visitatione reliquiarum Rosæ de more deputati inspectores, qui aperta areâ ligneâ repererunt virgineum corpusculum post quintum decimum expletum ab obitu annum, consumptis indumentis, ossibus integris, et adhuc siccâ hic inde carne obductis, quæ odorem rosarum exhalabant."

of witnesses, who were 183 in number,, could not be finished until the month of May, 1632. Inspectors were appointed to visit the remains of Rosa, who on the wooden tomb being opened, found the small body of the virgin wasted away, it being fifteen years after her death, the coverings decayed, the bones entire, and on their being brought to this place on that occasion, with the dry flesh, they exhaled the odour of roses."

This saint was no obscure one; for we are informed:—

"Cum igitur jam nihil deesset eorum, quæ sacrosanctæ functioni canonizationis hujus dilectæ Christi Domini Sponsæ Rosæ necessaria erant ex sanctorum Patrum auctoritate, sacrorum canonum decretis, et Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ antiquâ consuetudine, ac novorum decretorum præscripto; rogantibus carissimis in Christo filiis nostris Reginâ Mariannâ Regente, ac etiam Carolo II. itidem Hispaniarum rege, toto ordine fratrum prædicatorum Sancti Dominici, regno Peruano, et omnibus provinciis Americæ, accedentibus etiam precibus venerabilium fratrum nostrorum Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum regnorum Hispaniæ et Indiarum, justum et debitum esse censuimus, ut prædictam beatam, quam ipse Dominus de die in diem magis clarificat e cœlis, nos quoque venerationis officio laudemus et glorificemus in terris," &c.

"When therefore now nothing remained to be done but those things which, according to the authority of the holy Fathers, the decrees of the sacred canons, the ancient custom of the holy Roman Church, and the prescription of the new decrees, were necessary for the purpose of the holy function of canonization of this dearly beloved bride of the Lord Christ, Rosa; the same having been requested by our dear children in Christ, Queen Marianne the Regent, and Charles II. King of Spain, the whole order of the preaching brothers of St. Dominick, the kingdom of Peru, and all the provinces of America, to which were added the prayers of our venerable brothers the Archbishops and Bishops of Spain and of the Indies, we have thought it just and right, that the aforesaid blessed one, whom the Lord himself from heaven makes daily more celebrated, we should praise and glorify in an office of worship upon earth."

And the Pope decreed her canonization as follows:—

"Ad honorem sanctæ et individuæ Trinitatis, et fidei catholicæ exaltationem, auctoritate Omnipotentis Dei, Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, beatorum Apostolorum ac nostra, de venerabilium fratrum, nostrorum Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalium, Patriarcharum, Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum in Romanâ curiâ existentium consilio, ac unanimi consensu, beatam Rosam de Sancta Maria, Virginem Limanam, de cujus vitæ sanctitate, fidei sucerítate, ac miraculorum excellentiâ plane constat, Sanctam esse definivimus ac Sanctarum Virginum catalogo adscribendam decrevimus, prout præsentium tenore decernimus, definimus et adscribimus, statuentes ab ecclesiâ universâ quolibet anno die tricesimâ mensis Augusti memoriam ejus inter sanctas Virgines recoli debere, in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.

"Eâdem auctoritate omnibus et singulis vere pœnitentibus et confessis, qui annis singulis in die festo ipsius Sanctæ Rosæ ad sepulchrum, in quo ejus corpus requiescit, visitandum accesserint, septem annos et totidem quadragenas de injunctis eis aut aliis quomodo libet debitis pœnitentiis, misericorditer in Domino relaxavimus in formâ Ecclesiæ consuetâ." &c. &c.

"Datum Romæ apud Sm. Petrum anno incarnationis Dominicæ millesimo sexcentesimo septuagesimo primo, pridie Idus

"To the honour of the Holy and undivided Trinity, and the exaltation of the Catholic faith, by the authority of Almighty God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, of the blessed apostles, and by our own, with the advice and unanimous consent of our Venerable brethren the Cardinals, Patriarchs, Archbishops, and Bishops of the holy Roman Church, who are now in the Roman court, we have determined that the blessed Rosa of Sancta Maria, a Virgin of Lima, whose sanctity of life, sincerity of faith, *and excellency in miracles, is fully evident*, is a Saint; and we have decreed that she shall be inscribed in the catalogue of Holy Virgins, as we decree, determine, and inscribe, by the tenor of these presents, appointing that her memory be venerated by the universal Church among the Holy Virgins on the 30th day of August, in every year; in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Amen.

"By the same authority, to all and singular, truly penitent and confessing, who in every year on the festival of St. Rosa, shall go to visit the sepulchre in which her body rests, we grant indulgence mercifully in the Lord, according to the usual form of the Church, seven years, and so many of quadregenas from the penances enjoined upon them as otherwise due."

"Given at Rome before St. Peter's day, in the year of our Lord's Incarnation, 1671, on the day before the Ide of April, in

Aprilis, pontificatus nostri anno primo."	the first year of our pontificate."
"✠ Ego Clemens Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Episcopus."	"✠ I Clement, Bishop of the Catholic Church."
Also the signatures of thirty-five cardinals are appended to the bull.	

The following prayer is offered up by all Roman Catholics on every 30th of August:—

St. Rosa of Liman, Virgin. (Roman Missal. London, 1840, p. 684.) "O Almighty God, the giver of all good gifts, who wert pleased that blessed Rosa, abundantly favoured by the precious dew of heavenly grace, should beautify the Indies with her purity and patience; grant that we thy servants, following the perfume of her virtues, may become an agreeable odour to Christ."

Dr. Newman belongs to the Oratory, the founder of which is St. Philip Neri. His children in the Oratory will be refreshed by the following extracts. I have made a list of the remarkable miracles alleged to have been done by this saint; and of all the miracles which Dr. Newman accepts, and finds it impossible to resist, he certainly accepts those of his illustrious founder. In his book he states that his lectures were delivered in the home and under the shadow of St. Philip Neri. The miracles of St. Philip Neri are those he especially refers to; and it must be gratifying to Dr. Newman to be reminded of what were some of the illustrious miracles done by his own distinguished founder. But whether they are credible or consonant to reason is a very different question. I quote the history of them from 'Bollandi Acta Sanctorum. Acta Sanctorum, Maii; collecta, digesta, illustrata a Godefrido Henschenio et Daniele Papebrochio, e Societate Jesu. Tom vi., quo continentur dies 25, 26, 27, 28, operam et studium conferentibus Francisco Baertio et Conrado Janningo ejusdem

Societatis. Antwerpiæ, 1688.—Vita S. Philippi Nerii, auctore Antonio Gallonio, Oratorii Presbytero, Romæ edita, quinto post mortem Sancti anno.'

Hieronymus Bernabæus (Congregationis Oratorii S. Mariæ in Valicella dum viveret præpositus), in his Life of St. Philip Neri, says:—

"Quinquennio post beati patris excessum, quæ de illius vitâ moribusque sanctissimis, tum Latine tum etiam Italice scripserat Antonius Gallonius, in lucem edita sunt, ipso summo Pontifice approbante, eaque omnia sæpius magnâ cum animi jucunditate perlegente; multis etiam Cardinalibus in ipsâ libri fronte sic subscribentibus omnia quæ de Beato Philippo Nerio conscripta sunt, partim propriis oculis me vidisse, partim certo gravissimorum vivorum sermone cognovisse, attestor ego."—Tom. vi. p. 623.

"Five years after the departure of the blessed Father, those things which relate to his morals and life Antonius Gallonius wrote in Italian and Latin, and published, *with the approbation of the most high Pontiff himself, who often read them with great delight.* Many Cardinals also have thus written in the beginning of the book itself, 'I certify concerning all the things which are related of the Blessed Philip Neri, that some of them I have seen with my own eyes, and the rest I know to be true on the positive testimony of the most credible living witnesses.'"

Let us read some of those things which the Pope read with great delight, and which are said to have been done by Dr. Newman's father and founder; and in believing which, of course, he can see no difficulty whatever, or any doubt of credibility. 'Acta Sanctorum, Maii, tom. vi. p. 467, caput 11. Acta vitæ usque ad ordines sacros, annum ætatis 36.'

"Nam laicus cum esset, annum vitæ trigesimum non attingens, Christi scilicet anno millesimo quingentesimo quadragesimo quarto, eâ repente spiritûs vi repleri se sensit divinitus, eoque impetu, ut cor illico sibi intra corpus saltitare cœperit, eque ardore inflammari, ut eum natura, inusitatâ quâdam cordis palpitatione, omnino se

"For when he was a layman not yet thirty years of age, to wit, in the year 1544, he felt himself replenished with such power of the Divine Spirit, and with so great force, that he felt his heart leap within his body, and burn with so great heat that nature gave notice during this unwonted palpitation of his heart, that she could not bear it.

ferre non posse significaret. Quamobrem benignus Dominus, quo illum ad plurimorum salutem diutius conservaret, confractis atque in pugilli eoque majorem amplitudinem elatis duabus sinistri lateris costulis, quartâ scilicet et quintâ, ejusdem cordis sinum, quo id liberius ageretur, mirum in modum ampliavit. Erat istiusmodi fractura in anteriore parte pectoris, ubi costæ in cartilaginem desinunt. Quo ex tempore, adeo vehementer amplius quinquaginta totos annos agitari concutique cœpit assidue plus minusve, mox atque mente rapiebatur in Deum, ut non modo toto corpore contremisceret, verum etiam lectulus ipse, aliaque omnia quibus ille insidebat, quasi terræ motu actæ, eo orante quaterentur."—Ann. ætatis 29; Christi, 1544.

Wherefore, the gracious Lord, in order to spare him for the salvation of many, having broken two of his ribs, and increased the space above a hand-breadth by lifting them up, of his left side, namely the fourth and fifth, wonderfully enlarged the sphere of the heart, for the purpose of its freer action. A fracture was made in this manner in the anterior part of the breast, where the ribs terminate in cartilage. From which time his heart began to be so vehemently shaken and agitated for upwards of fifty years, more or less; soon after he was so mentally carried away toward God, that he not only kept quaking all over, but his very bed, and all other things on which he usually sat, were shaken as by an earthquake while he prayed!!"

These extravagancies, which are declared to be miraculous, are stated in one of the highest Roman Catholic authorities. But, indeed, it needs not my special references. No priest is ashamed of them.

"Cœpit in suo cubiculo, singulis a prandio diebus, confluentes, lectulo frequenter insidens, (quod Dei amore langueret), de rebus cœlestibus erudire. In his colloquiis (quod mirabile dictum est) eam divini amoris vim sentiebat, ut modo toto corpore contremisceret, modo e lectulo in attolleretur, (crederes eum ab aliquo sic mirabiliter retineri), modo demum lectulus ipse, vel quandoque etiam ipsum cubiculum motu nutare et concuti videretur, terræmotum ibi factum esse putares."—Ib. p. 471.

"Every day, after dinner, he began to teach those who came to him, frequently seated on his bed, because he was sick with the love of God. What is wonderful to be told, during these conferences he felt that power of Divine love, that at one time he shook violently all over his body, at another he was lifted into the air, so that you would believe he was there held by some one; and at other times the bed itself seemed so to nod and vibrate, that you would have supposed it was an earthquake."

"Initio Sacerdotii, cum in ec-

"In the beginning of the

olesia S. Hieronymi sacrum ageret, tantâ repente divini Spiritûs abundantiâ replebatur, ut aquam vinumque in calicem de more infundere vix posset; adeo enim ejus manus in altum attollebantur, ut exsilire quodam modo et saltitare viderentur; atque ille, nisi brachio ad altare tanquam adminiculo maximo annixus studia, cœptum opus prosecutum esset, nihil egisset unquam. . . . Quo tempore salutarem hostiam de more attollebat, ita mens rapiebatur in Deum, ut manus sublime erectas deponere non posset. Retulit illo postea, videri sibi se ab aliquo apprehendi, atque alte a terrâ per vim mirabiliter sustolli."—Ib. p. 470.

priesthood, when he was engaged in sacred duties in St. Jerome's Church, he was suddenly filled with so great abundance of the Divine Spirit, that he could not pour the wine and water into the chalice as usual, for his hands were so lifted up on high, that sometimes they seemed to leap up and dance vigorously; and he never could do anything, unless, in order to enable him to finish what he began, he leant with his arm upon the altar, and was propped up with the greatest care. . . . At the time of his lifting up the salutary host, his mind was so carried away toward God, that he could not draw down his hands lifted on high. He related afterwards, that he seemed to himself to have been seized by some one, and miraculously and forcibly lifted on high from the earth."

"Anno Domini circiter millesimo quingentesimo quinquagesimo primo, cum iter Philippo esset, quem multi sequebantur, eum in locum, ubi exstant Thermæ, quas Diocletianas appellamus; vidit in quodam parieto vetustate collapso stantem dæmonem hominis specie, quem cum attentius inspiceret, observabat eum nunc juvenem, nunc senem apparere. Quibus rebus dæmonis insidias agnoscens, Christi nomine imperat ut qui sit aperiat. His ille victus celeri fugâ sese proripuit, odoreque teterrimo, quo absens locum illum implevit, quem ne bestiæ quidem ferre possent, ecquis tandem esset Philippo cæterisque qui aderant spectatoribus patefecit."—Ib. p. 473.

"About the year 1551, when Philip was on a journey, and many following him, toward the place where are the Baths of Diocletian, he saw on an old and ruinous wall the devil standing in the likeness of a man, and on attentive examination he saw him at one time appear as a young man, and again as an old man. Knowing the devil's tricks from these things, he ordered him in the Name of Christ to disclose himself. Overcome by this, the devil took to his heels, and he discovered himself to Philip and the other spectators by the most offensive smell which he left behind—a smell which not even the beasts of the field were able to bear."

Now, Dr. Newman says that such miracles are ante-

cedently as credible as the miracles of Scripture. Again—

"Francisco, ex ejus discipulis uni, Ferrariensi cognomento, dæmon noctu sanctissimæ Virginis instar apparuit; id autem eo consilio ut vel sic hominem eâ specie facilius deciperet. Idque cum is mane ad Philippum detulisset; Non tibi, inquit ille, sanctissima Dei mater, ut putas, sed dæmon ejus in formâ sese vivendum obtulit; itaque cum primum eadem visio tibi se denuo objiciet, faciem ejus qui apparet conspuas jubeo. Insequenti nocte, Ferrariensi magno animi ardore precanti, dæmon eâdem specie atque eodem fulgore micans præsto est; qui præcepti beati Patris haud immemor, diaboli mox faciem sputo fœdat, quâ re confusus dæmon turpiterque superatus evanuit. Vixque ille aufugerat, cum sacratissima Virgo ei sese palam ostendit; eum ut faciem ejus conspuat, modo id possit, movet; demum recreatum mirifice relinquens abiit."—Ib. p. 476.

"To Francis, one of his disciples, whose cognomen was Ferrariensis, the devil appeared by night like the most holy Virgin Mary, with the purpose of more easily deceiving him under that form. When he told Philip of it in the morning, he said, 'Not the most holy Mother of God, but the devil presented himself in that form; therefore, when he again presents himself to you, spit in his face.' The following night, while Francis was praying with great devotion, the devil appeared in the same form, and shining with the same splendour; he, mindful of the advice of the blessed Father, spat all over the devil's face, who, confounded by this occurrence, basely ran away. Scarcely had he run away, when the most holy Virgin showed herself openly to him, and advised him to spit in the devil's face, provided it can be done, and then, leaving him wonderfully refreshed, she departed."

This is another miracle which Dr. Newman regards as being as credible as the miracles of Scripture. Again, this author tells us—

"Eo ipso anno millesimo quingentesimo quinquagesimo octavo, Persianus Rosa, sacerdos, qui Philippo a sacerdotibus erat, ægrotabat gravissime, cumque ad ultimum periculi venisset, a diabolo nigerrimi canis specie vexari cœpit acerrime. His in angustiis divinum magna animi demissione implorabat auxilium, illud Psalmi frequenter inclamans, 'Judica me, Deus, et dis-

"In that same year 1558, Persianus Rosa, a priest, who was appointed to Philip from the priests, was very ill, and when he had reached his greatest danger, he began to be bitterly vexed by the devil, in the shape of a jet-black dog. In this perplexity he implored the Divine help, with great dejection of mind, often uttering that part of the Psalm, 'Judge me, O God, and

cerne causam meam.' Cumque hunc in modum cum communi hoste decertaret, venit improviso Philippus. Quem ubi ille vidit, clamare continuo cœpit, 'Adjuva me, sancte Philippe: est hic canis colore nigerrimus, qui me lacerare nititur. succurre, quæso, succurre quod potes, ne devorer.' Quibus verbus motus beatus Pater, humi illico, adstantibus primum ut pro ægro vel semel orationem Dominicam recitent jussis, sese prostravit. Quod cum faceret, 'Ecce tibi,' ille derepente magna voce dicere cœpit. Canis recedit; fugit canis; et in limine ostii stat. Tum surgens ab oratione Philippus piacularis aquæ aspersione dæmonem ab eo etiam loco fugavit, magno cum solatio morientis."—Id. p. 478.

decide my cause.' While he was battling with the enemy in this style, Philip unexpectedly came to him, on seeing whom he began to cry incessantly, 'Help me, holy Philip, for there is here a dog of very black colour, who tries to tear me in pieces. Save me, I beseech thee, for thou art able; save me from being devoured.' The blessed Father, moved by these words, and having commanded those who stood by to offer up the Lord's Prayer once, at least, for the sick man, fell prostrate on the ground. When he had done so, 'Here is for you!' he began to say, suddenly with a loud voice. The dog recedes; the dog flies; and stands on the threshold. Then, rising from prayer, Philip routed the devil entirely from that place, by the sprinkling of holy water, to the great comfort of the dying man."

The same author gives another instance of the saint's miraculous expulsion of the devil, from which it appears that Dr. Newman's founder had some very strange tricks and propensities about him; but, as they are all miraculous, they are, of course, most edifying to the fathers and brothers of the Oratory.

"Quodam autem die, beato viro Catharinam ferreis catenatis immisericorditer verberante,"

"One day, while the holy man was flogging a lady named Catharine with small iron chains, in the most merciless manner,"

(—not a very saintly act, one would suppose—)

"dæmon alta voce clamare cœpit, 'Cæde jam, percute, occide.' . . . . Cum quondam die eâ ipsâ de quâ diximus Catharina Philippi jussa flagellis cæsa fuit; insequenti nocte eidem Philippo, suo clauso cubiculo, apparuit Satan, qui minacibus oculis illum

"the devil began to bellow with a loud voice, 'Beat now, strike! kill!' . . . . . When on the very day we have mentioned Catharine was beaten with whips, Satan appeared to Philip at night, his chamber being closed, and, beholding him with threat-

intuitus in has prorupit voces; 'Heus, heus, bone vir, hodie pro tuæ voluntatis arbitrio auctoritate meæ illusisti, at ego injuriarum non obliviscar.' Et his dictis confestim evanuit."—Ibid. p. 491.

"Eodem, opinor, anno, cum esset Philippus in ecclesiâ, dedit sese ei in conspectum diabolus puerili formâ ut eum irrideret. At ille subodoratus confestim qui esset, qui alienâ specie ad se illudendum venerat, eum advocat, contemnit, demumque ab ecclesiâ ejicit."—Ibid. p. 499.

ening eyes, broke forth into these expressions, 'Ho, ho, good fellow, at your pleasure you have to-day mocked my authority, but I will take care not to forget the injuries you have done.' Having said these words he disappeared."

"The same year, I think, when Philip was at church, the devil presented himself to him in the form of a little boy, in order to laugh at him; but Philip, smelling out who he was who had come to mock him under another form, cites him, despises him, and at last thrusts him out of the church."

I give a very antecedently credible miracle to the Oratorian Fathers:—

"Mediâ vero hieme, quo tempore maximum in urbe frigus esse solet, ad postremum usque diem (quis crederet?)"

"About the middle of winter, when the cold is usually greatest in the city, at the close of the day (who could believe it?)"

(—the Roman Catholic historian, the Böllandist, says, "Who can believe it?" The answer, in Dr. Newman's Lectures is, "I see no difficulty in believing it"—)

"ita derepente eo orante ipsius cor corpusque divino æstuabat igne, ut validissimâ, ne æstu necaretur, refrigeratione indigeret."

"while he was praying," his heart and body so burned with Divine fire, that he stood in need of the greatest cooling, lest he should be killed by the heat."

Now, conceive his divine love being so hot within as to cause the risk of St. Philip Neri disappearing by spontaneous combustion.

"Hinc ille octogenarius, modicissimo cibo contentus, omni propemodum nativo calore destitutus, ut eam amoris flammam aliquo modo restingueret, pectus nudare, fenestras foresque

"Hence he, an old man of eighty, very sparing in his diet, and destitute of all natural heat, that he might quench in any way such a flame of love, felt it necessary, in order to cool him-

cubiculi mediâ nocte pandere, linteisque ac flabellis, aliâve opportuniore aeris agitatione uti, ad se refrigerandum necesse habebat; et quidem ni cordi, intero ac divino consumpto calore, hisce rebus festinanter subvenisset, repentino certe interiisset."—Ibid. p. 467.

self, to bare his bosom, to throw open the windows and doors of his bedchamber at midnight, and to use linen clothes, and fans, and any other way of agitating the air; and, indeed, unless he had come speedily to the relief of his heart by these means, consumed as it was by divine heat, he would certainly have suddenly died."

Such is another credible miracle recorded of Dr. Newman's founder. We are told at another part—

"Tum motans subinde manus lacrymarum plenus, quasi beatissimam Virginem obviis ulnis amplecteretur, hisce vocibus assidue clamabat; 'O Sanctissima Dei mater; O omnium creaturarum ut optima, ita et pulcherrima!' et hæc cum effaretur, toto corpore, nullo fultus adminiculo, cubito circiter vel etiam plus eo sublimis, mirandum in modum attollebatur."—Ibid. p. 510.

"Then moving his hands, and full of tears, as if he embraced the most blessed Virgin in his arms, he continually exclaimed in these words, 'O most holy mother of God! O most excellent and beautiful of all creatures!' and when he had uttered these words, he was raised from the ground with his whole body, leaning on no support, about a cubit, or even more, in the most wonderful manner."

"Mulier quædam erat clarissimis natalibus, abundans pietate magis quam divitiis, una ex his quæ templum nostrum frequentant; hæc ubi inter initia obitus Philippi propter ejus sepulchrum oraret, odorem inde confestim suaviter jucundeque spirantem sensit; quo mirifice recreata, cum secum ipsa cogitaret, unde is manare posset, comperit tandem stupore attonita (quod nullus ibi flos erat, nullaque res quæ tanto halaret odore), e Philippi corpore, nullis unguentis delibuto aut balsamo condito effluere. Erat suavitas odorum qui afflantur e floribus, rosis, violis, et id genus aliis."—Ibid. p. 516.

"A certain woman of very high rank, more rich in piety than wealth, one of those who frequent our church, prayed amongst the first after the death of Philip near his tomb, and she smelt immediately a most sweet and agreeable smell proceeding therefrom, by which she was wonderfully refreshed; and after thinking to herself whence it could proceed, and wondering at it (because there was not a flower there, nor anything which could exhale such a smell), she discovered that it proceeded from the body of Philip itself, since there were no balms nor perfumes from which it could rise. The smell partook of the sweetness of

the odours which proceed from roses and violets, and others of that genus."

In 'Vita S. Philippi Neri per R. P. Hieronymum Bernabæum, Congregationis Oratorii S. Mariæ in Vallicellâ dum viveret præpositum,' we are told—

"Cum enim obsessæ cuidam manum imposuisset, tam gravi odore ex eo contactu imbutam sensit, ut per plures dies illum abstergere nequiverit; quamvis saponem atque alia hujusmodi smegmata adhibuerit. Itaque multis suorum manum ipsam porrigebat, ut scilicet graveolentiam illam percipientes, peccatorum contagia longissime devitarent.' —P. 592.

"For when he placed his hand upon a certain possessed woman, it was tainted with such a strong odour, that he was not able to get rid of it for many days, although he used soap and other washes of that kind. Therefore he stretched out his hand to many of his people, so that they perceiving the unpleasant smell, might take care always to avoid it.'

And then another antecedently credible miracle is stated by the same credible historian as follows:—

"Denique tanto eum odio diabolus insequebatur, ut ille si pium quidpiam aggressus esset, molestius semper adversaretur. Igitur noctu oranti sese obtulit truculento et terribili aspectu: at ille, implorato Dei matris auxilio, importunissimum hostem extemplo fugavit. Secesserat aliquando ad orandum in superiorem partem cubiculi, quod quidem malignus cum ferre non posset, injectis sordibus vestem fœdavit. Alias insuper grandiori tabulâ illum opprimere tentavit; sæpe ægrotanti lucernam extinxit; sæpissime vero ingentes strepitus in ejus cubiculo audiebantur, quare Gallonius, qui inferius habitabat, frequenter somnum abrumpere et ad Philippum provolare cogebatur; sed huc illucque sollicitis oculis circumspiciens,

"Lastly, the devil followed him with so much hatred, that if he was engaged in any pious work, the devil always thwarted him in a most troublesome manner. Thus, whilst Philip was praying in the night, the devil presented himself before him, putting on a most savage and terrible look; but by imploring the assistance of the mother of God, he immediately drove away his excessively troublesome enemy. Sometimes, when he retired to the upper part of his bedchamber to pray, the malignant devil not being able to bear it, threw dirt upon his clothes. At other times, moreover, he seized Philip's large table, and threw it at him; often he put out his candle; and very often loud noises were heard in his bedroom, by which Gallonius, who

cum nihil quidquam viderat, dæmonum ludibria hæc esse satis aperte intelligebat."—Ibid. p. 592.

lived in the room below, was frequently awoke out of his sleep, and compelled to run up stairs to Philip, to see what was the matter; but on looking all round his room, nothing whatever could be seen, and he was then perfectly satisfied these were some of the devil's tricks."

Again, we have in 'Bollandi Acta Sanctorum, Maii, Appendix, Relatio de Sudore Imaginis Patavinæ, auctore Jacobo Philippo Thomasino, Civitatis-Novæ Episcopo,' the following account of Philip's image:—

"Die post quarto, id est, xxii Aprilis, mane iterum sudare cœpit eadem imago, signanterque notabantur majores guttæ duæ, una sub oculo sinistro, altera ex eadem parte qua os desinit. Accurrerunt omnes Oratorii presbyteri ad intuendam rem adeo miram," &c.—P. 650.

"On the 22nd of April, in the morning, the image of St. Philip Neri began to perspire, two large drops being particularly noticed, one under the left eye, and the other on the same side of the mouth. All the priests of the Oratory ran immediately to see so wonderful a thing," &c.

A variety of other instances of this miraculous perspiration are given in this narrative, which occupies five folio pages. The Bishop in his preface favours us with the following remarks:—

"Sudare et lacrymari imagines ominosum semper antiquitati fuit. Unde S. Augustinus, libro de Civit. Dei, c. 12, refert statuam Apollinis Cumani per quatuor dies plorasse; supra quem locum Coqueens adducit locum T. Livii, lib. xliii. eumque confirmat auctoritate Ciceronis, lib. i. de Divinatione, et Julii Obsequentis, lib. de Prodigiis, asserentium, rem a divinatoribus sic acceptam, quasi proxima Græcorum ruina et Romanorum felicitas eo ploratu significatæ fuerint. Similiter Lucanus inter belli civilis præsagia numerat,

"In ancient times it was always an ominous thing for images to weep and perspire. Whence St. Augustine, in his book de Civit. Dei, c. 12, tells us, that the statue of Apollo Cumanus wept four days; to which instance Coqueens adds a passage from Livy, lib. xliii. and confirms him by the authority of Cicero, lib. i. de Divinatione and Julius Obsequens, in his book on Miracles, asserting it as a thing accepted by all seers, that the approaching ruin of the Grecians, and the prosperity of the Romans were prognosticated by the weeping

"Indigetes flevisse Deos, urbisque laborem
Testatos sudore Lares."

of that statue. In like manner Lucan enumerates amongst the foretokens of the civil war, the fact that the images of the gods had wept, and that the household gods had given notice of the approaching distress of the city by perspiring.

"Nos contra sudorem ab imagine S. Philippi Nerii expressum, putamus fuisse effectum visceralis erga Deum amoris."—Ibid. p. 549. Præfatio.

"We, on the other hand, think that the perspiration that came out of the image of St. Philip Neri was the effect of his visceral love toward God."

In the 'Magnum Bullarium Romanum,' &c., tom. v. p. 1, Luxemburgi, 1727, 'Urbanus VIII. 1623. Obiit Philippus, 26 Maii, 1595;' after stating, "Urbanus Episcopus, Servus Servorum Dei, ad perpetuam rei memoriam, Rationi congruit," we have some further accounts of St. Philip Neri, as follows:—

"Ac vix annum ætatis suæ vicesimum nonum attigerat, cum inter alia divinitus accepta dona, plane mirabilis cordis palpitatio fuit ac fracturæ costarum; quæ publico medicorum testimonio præter naturæ ordinem obtigit, quasi mentis dilatato sinu, etiam caro dilataretur, et exsultaret in Deum vivum."

"And he had hardly attained his twenty-ninth year, when amongst other divine gifts, he had most certainly a wonderful palpitation of the heart and fractures of his ribs; which thing happened to him contrary to the order of nature, according to the public testimony of medical men, as if by the enlargement of his mind his flesh was enlarged also, and rejoiced in the living God."

Now, I submit, it was a very remarkable soul that could not get room to think, and it must have been very intense love which necessitated the fracture of two of Philip's ribs, in order that it might have room to develop itself. But still these miracles are so popular, and so antecedently credible in the minds of Roman Catholic historians, that there are duplicates of the narrative from which I give the account of them:—

"Non est omittendum quod is fuit in primis caritate in Deum admirabili, ut interus ille ignis nonnunquam, cum attenderet ad divina, redundaret in corpus, et facies atque oculi scintillulis micarent."

"It must not be forgotten that in his early years, such was his wonderful love to God, that when he was occupied about divine things the internal fire overabounded in his body, and his face and eyes emitted sparks of fire."

I said that some of the Roman Catholic saints seemed like electric jars: this last saint was more than a jar—we might almost call him a living volcano, his eyes and whole face being the crater, and often emitting sparks of fire. Again—

"Caritati virginitatis donum adjunctum habuit, quo multi qui cum ipse versabantur, vel vultus atque oculorum intuitu, vel suavi fragrantiâ, quâ illius corpus redolere consueverat, recreabantur."

"He possessed together with the gift of love, that of virginity, on account of which many who conversed with him were refreshed, either by the aspect of his countenance and eyes, or by the sweet smell which usually proceeded from his body."

From this it is plain that St. Philip Neri was also a kind of bottle of eau de Cologne, or lavender water. Again, we are told—

"Illud etiam Philippo collatum a Deo fuit, ut dum uno inesset in loco, in alio longe distante, uno eodemque prorsus tempore nonnullis apparuerit."

"Philip also was so favoured by God, that whilst he was in one place he visibly appeared at the same time to some who were in another place far distant."

"Quampluriam insuper confitentium atque amicorum animas in cœlum intueri, atque angelos concinentes interim audire solitus erat, quinetiam interiorem eorum pulchritudinem, qui essent in statu gratiæ, divinitus agnoscebat."

"Furthermore, he often saw the souls of many who confessed to him, and of his friends in heaven, and sometimes he heard the angels singing, and he also divinely recognised the interior beauty of those who were in a state of grace."

"Post hæc, ubi selectione in loco corpus reconditum est, ad ipsum venerandum populi concursus fieri, votivæ deferri tabulæ, donaria multa appendi, ac

"After these things, crowds of people came to the place where by selection his body was buried, to venerate him, votive tablets were brought, and many

suavissimus quidam odor a multis inde percipi cœpit."

offerings appended, and a most sweet odour began to be perceived there by many."

In the 'Breviarum Romanum ex Decreto SS. Concilii Tridentini restitutum S. Pii. V. Pont. Max. jussu editum, et Clementis VIII. primum, nunc denuo Urbani P. P. VIII. auctoritate recognitum. Antwerpiæ, 1823.' 'Pars Verna, festa Maii, die xxvi. Mai. Philippus Nerius, &c. Lec. v.,' we are told—

"Charitate Dei vulneratus languebat jugiter; tantoque cor ejus æstuabat ardore, ut cum intra fines suos contineri non posset, illius sinum, confractis atque elatis duabus costulis, mirabiliter Dominus ampliaverit. Sacrum vero faciens, aut ferventius orans, in aere quandoque sublatus, mirâ undique luce fulgere visus fuit."

"He languished in consequence of being continually in pain from the love of God; and his heart so burned with heat, that it could not be kept within its boundaries; but the Lord wonderfully enlarged his thorax by breaking and raising two of his ribs. Whilst saying mass, or praying fervently, he was raised into the air and appeared luminous."

This Breviary exceeds the Bull of Canonization; since it not only states inward heat and sparks of fire, but informs us that he was elevated and carried into the air, where he appeared luminous, something like a rocket, or an aurora borealis, one would suppose. Yet it is all "antecedently credible." Again, Lectio vi.—

"In animorum sensibus penetrandis mirifice enituit. Virginitatem perpetuo illibatam servavit; idque assecutus est, ut eos, qui puritatem colerent, ex odore, qui vero secus ex fœtore dignosceret; absentibus interdum apparuit; usque periclitantibus opem tulit .... Cœlestium Spirituum et ipsius Deiparæ frequenter fuit apparitione dignatus; ac plurimorum animas splendore circum-

"He was wonderfully famous for his powers of seeing into men's souls. He lived in perpetual virginity; and he so acquired the sense of smell, that he could discern by the sweet odour which proceeded from them, those who lived in purity, and by their bad smell, those who were the reverse; sometimes he appeared to those who were absent from him, and he gave assistance to those who

fusas in cœlum conscendere vidit."

were in peril everywhere .... He frequently was thought worthy to enjoy visions of the heavenly spirits, and of the mother of God herself; and he saw the souls of many ascend into heaven in a halo of glory."

It is said in the Breviary that Gregory XV. placed St. Philip Neri among the saints; but Gregory XV. died before he could issue the Bull of the Canonization, which was accordingly issued by his successor, Urban VIII.

Now, concerning the whole of these miracles, one must remark, there is a revolting materialism about them all. Every spiritual and moral feature is carnalized, till miraculous devotion explodes in sparks, and ardent affection breaks the ribs, and heavenly desires lift men off their feet. Conceive what a power Dr. Newman's father and founder must have had, to have been able to detect a bad man by the sense of smell, and a good man equally by the same faculty. Now, if Dr. Newman, as an Oratorian, has the extraordinary talent of his distinguished founder, the people of Birmingham must beware: he will be able at a single whiff to determine who are the pure and the impure among them; and, without the aid of the confessional, to know all that relates to them. But, soberly, I would ask, does Dr. Newman mean to say that these miracles are antecedently as probable as the miracles of Jesus and his Apostles? Is not the divinity of the latter proof of the earthly origin of the former? These miracles are taken from the highest Roman Catholic authorities, not to be smiled at, nor for the sake of exciting your merriment, as Romanists may probably allege, but solemnly and sorrowfully as specimens—authentic specimens—of the miracles said to have been wrought by the distinguished saints of the Church of Rome, and among the rest, by Dr. New-

man's own founder, St. Philip Neri; and I appeal to the common sense, the intuitive and broad intelligence of all who read these lines, are these miracles to be spoken of in the same breath, or to be placed in the same category with the majestic and glorious miracles which are the credentials of the Word of God—the miracles of the Lord Jesus Christ?

The next batch of "credible" miracles I will present are the miracles of a Neapolitan saint, Sister Maria Francisca, of the Wounds of our Lord Jesus Christ, of the order of the barefooted Minors of St. Peter of Alcantara.

Her canonization was petitioned for by Charles Emmanuel IV. King of Sardinia, by Francis Bourbon, Prince of Naples, by the Senate of the city of Naples, by the Most Eminent and Reverend Cardinal Archbishop of Naples, by the Most Reverend Chapter and Canons of the Metropolitan Church of Naples, by the Congregation of the Servant of God, Maria Francisca, of the Wounds of Jesus Christ. All these letters, addressed to Pope Pius VII., 1800, are given at full length at the end of the volume I quote; and we are informed that thirty-two other letters, with the same petition, were written by Roman Catholic Archbishops, Chapters, Abbots, &c., whose names and titles are fully given.

The book which contains the summary of the evidence of the seventy-eight witnesses who were examined respecting her life, faith, virtues, and miracles, is entitled, 'Sacra Rituum Congregatione Emo. et Rmo. Domino Card. Pignatello Neapolitana, Beatificationis et Canonizationis Servæ Dei Sor. Mariæ Franciscæ a Vulneribus D.N.J.C., Tertiariæ professæ Ordinis Minorum Excalceatorum S. Petri de Alcantara Urbis Neapolis. Summarium super introductione Causæ. Romæ, 1803, apud Lazarinum

R.C.A. typographum.' At the end of the volume, we find, — "Revisa. A Gardellini, Subpromotor Fidei."

It is perhaps unnecessary to observe that Sister Maria Francisca is reported to have had a great reverence for the Pope and the Priests. In a vision (p. 243), she is said to have seen Pope Pius VI. in his pontificals, attended by two angels. She is related, moreover, to have entertained a peculiar devotion to the Virgin Mary; to the Sacrament of the Eucharist: to have venerated sacred images; and to have practised the discipline, that is, self-flagellation, with a most awful severity. Such is the Romish system. Whilst the New Testament, which relates the life, conduct, and miracles of Christ and the Apostles, is withheld from the Italian people, the exemplars of Romish saints recommend the worst superstitions, fanaticism, idolatry, and priestcraft of the Church of Rome to the admiration, imitation, and veneration of the people.

At present we shall instance only some of the miracles which are reported by various witnesses, the summary of whose evidence is contained in these volumes. The work consists of two volumes, one of them is written in Latin, and the other, from which I have copied these extracts, is in Italian. I shall only briefly mention some of the miracles, referring to the pages which contain the account of them; but if the Rev. Dr. Newman or any other desire to inspect the work in my presence, or in the presence of George Finch, Esq., in whose library, at Burly-on-the-Hill, it now is, they shall be most welcome.

Miraculous Ecstasies.

The first miracle I shall refer to is her wonderful ecstasies. It is related of her that she was seen on one occasion to be raised several palms high from the ground, and that she had been seen to fly to the church

without touching the ground with her feet:—"Fu veduta sollevata più palmi dal suolo e colle bracchie aperte, quando portavasi alla nostra chiesa, volava senza toccar piedi in terra."—P. 263.

The ardour of her Love to the Eucharist.

Her love to the Sacrament of the Altar was so fierv (ignitus), that on one occasion she cried out, "Water! water!" and her companion was obliged to dip handkerchiefs into the holy water, and to apply them to her breast:—"Si accesa detta serva di Dio talmente d' amore verso detto Augustissimo Sagramente, che cominciò a chiadere, 'Acqua! acqua!' onde fu costretta detta compagna ad inzuppare fazzoletti nella fonte dell' acqua benedetta, ed applicarceli sul petto."—P. 220.

Blinded by the rays of a holy Bambino.

When placing a holy Bambino (*i.e.* image of the infant Jesus) into the manger (nel presepio), such brilliant rays of light proceeded from the Bambino, as to blind her for three days; and she recovered her sight through the prayers, obedience, and blessings of Padre Salvadore, her director:—"Altra volta, nel fare la detta funzione, furono, per essa si penetranti e resplendenti i raggi che uscirono, dal S. Bambino, che la fecero, restare cieca nell' intutto per tre giorni, che poi all' orazione, ubbidienza e benedizione datala dal P. Salvadore, dal quale mi fu raccontato, ricuperò la vista."—P. 213.

She possessed a holy Bambino, which emitted a supernatural sweet odour, and which on one occasion stretched out its feet and hands (p. 213), when it was dressed by Sister Francisca, at her bidding.

"Teneva ancora dentro di una gran Teca di fiori di essa lavorati un bellissimo Bambino di relievo di un palmo di grandezza, pulito e graziosamente vestito di calza, e scarpe, con corona in testa e con un Anello al dito, che spirava un odore soavissimo e

straordinario, quale lo conserva amore al presente, ma non tanto quanto prima, e tantora, quanto per lo passato fu stimato da tutti sopranaturale Questo Bambino s' era la cosa più preziosa da Suor Maria Francesca, per cui lo teneva come un Santuario, e solamenta l' aprivo ne maggiori bisogni, ma prima v' accendeva le Candeli avanti, siccome fa ancora il Rev. D. Giovanni Pessivi, in poter del quale è restato ancora per le supradette* relazioni un ammirabile avvenimento, cioè, che quando Suor Maria Francesca fece al detto Bambino le vesti, le calze, e le scarpe, non potendo metterle, disse, 'Mino mio, se non stendi i piedi, non posso calzarci,' ed il Bambino puntualmente li stendeva. Così fece ancora colle manine per mettergli il vestito, che ancora tiene." "When Sister Maria Francisca made for the same Bambino its robes, and stockings, and shoes, not being able to put them on, she said to it, 'My little child, if you do not stretch out your feet I cannot put on your shoes and stockings,' and the Bambino instantly stretched them out. It did the same with its little hands, in order to put on the robe which it now has." Such were the miraculous doings of a wooden image of the Saviour.

The devil throws a great stone at her, which strikes the window, and nearly kills a poor man in the street.

"Un† altra volta mentre stava secondo il solito inchiodata nel letto, e che io, e molti altri, sacerdoti le facevamo compagnia seduti d' intorno, aspergendo da tempo in tempo il letto, e la stanza con l' acqua santa; tutto ad un tempo ci disse. 'Levatemi da dirimpetto la finestra, perchè peruchella (così soleva

* The relation of Padre Felice, her Confessor, confirmed by Sister Maria Felicia and Sister Theodora Tipaldi.

† This is the testimony of the Perillustris et Adm. Rev. Dominus D. Joannes Pessiri, Presbyter.

chiamare il demonio) minaccia volermi menare una pietra.' Non tanto ci fummo scostati da detto luogo, che fu lanciata con impeto straordinario da mano invisibile una grossa pietra, che colpendo su la crociera di della finestra, cadde abbasso la strada, e poco mancò che non restasse ucciso un pover' uomo, che vendeva frutti giusto sotto d' essa."

"Once when she was, as usual, confined to her bed, and when I and many other priests kept her company sitting round her, sprinkling the bed and the apartment from time to time with holy water, all at once she said to us, 'Take me away from before the window, because Peruchella (thus she was accustomed to call the devil) threatens to throw a stone at me.' We had hardly removed from the place, when a great stone was hurled by an invisible hand, which, striking against the casement of the window, fell down into the street, and very nearly left for dead a poor man, who sold fruit just underneath."

She inflicts upon herself the most dreadful scourgings, which she offered to the Lord for the souls in purgatory and chiefly for dead priests!!!

"Rapporto alle discipline, che faceva nascostamente, So,* che se ne faceva a sangue la settimana, delle quali una l' offeriva al Signore per le anime nel purgatorio, e specialmente de' sacerdoti defunti," &c. —P. 228.

On one occasion her scourging was so severe that the bleeding continued for several days, and was at last stopped by applying to it, by the advice of her director, a picture of the Virgin Mary, which emitted an odour of Paradise, which it retained for a whole year.

The evidence is given by Adm. Rev. P. F. Aloysius, Maria a Jesu, Sacerdos professus ordinis Minor S. Petri de Alcantara, Lector, Definitor, Visitator, ac

* Rev. Dominus D. Joannes Pessiri, Presbyter.

Missionarius Apostol. (oculatus 34 circ. postremis servæ Dei vitæ annis), folio, 1602, ter. sup. 76 arti. (p. 278): "Mi fu referito dal P. Salvadore, che una volta la serva di Dio non so per qual' appresa, ma non commessa colpa, si flagellò talmente, che non poteva in verun conto ristagnare il sangue, ma come il detto direttore la vedeva patire, la precettò con S. Ubbidienza a manifestarle il tutto, indi le ordinò, che ci avesse applicata una figurina della divina Pastoretta, sebbene da Suor Maria Francesca vi si trovava repugnanza, e solo effetto della poca riverenza, che avrebbe usata alla Virgine Ssma., ma finalmente ubbidì, e la mattina d' appresso si trovò sana prodigiosamente, senza che detta figurina in carta si fusse in menoma parte macchiata di sangue, e che tramandava un odore di Paradiso, per cui la volte il detto direttore, et la tenne presso di se conservata per un anno in circa, senza mai perdere detto gratissimo odora quale usciva solo dalla parte dell' imagine."

The nature of her scourgings may be presumed, from the fact that she is said to have had an iron scourge, and to have put in it iron stars and sharp spurs.

Witness, Soror Maria Felix, a passione Tertiariâ ord. S. Petri de Alcantara: "E mi ricordo di più, che in tempo di detti S. Esercizi tenendo nelle sue mani una disciplina di ferro, colla medesima disciplinando se stessa, insegniva aviche il demonio di notte tempo, quando procurava tentarla. Si batteva con una disciplina armata di stelle di ferro, ed acuti speroni."—P. 378.

She obtained permission from the Saviour to undergo, for a time, instead of certain persons who are named, and among the rest is one of her confessors, called Il. P. Maestro Giuseppe Gricco Antonio, for whom she suffered, for the space of a month, the dreadful pains of purgatory. Her sufferings are

described as follows, by the illustrious and Rev. John Pessiri, a priest: "After having offered herself to the Lord, she remained for hours, days, and weeks, and sometimes for a month, confined to and immovable in a bed, transfixed in all the senses of her body, with inexpressible pains, sometimes with the total loss of all sense and strength. In fact, she was reduced to a very skeleton, so that the bare sight of her excited compassion."

"Dopo essersi offerta al Signore, restava per ore, par giorni, e per settimane, e certe volte per un mese inchiodata ed immobile in un letto trafitta da inesprimabili dolor in tutti li sensi del corpo colla perdita intera talvolta di tutti li sensi, e le forze in somma si riduceva come in vero cadavere che recava compassione al solo vederla—siccomè è noto anche ad altri testimoni."—P. 282.

The Saviour often appeared to her in the Sacrament, in the form of a little child.

Witness, Soror Maria Felix, a passione Tertiariâ ord. S. Petri de Alcantara: "Mi costa (constat) ancora di certa scienza, che il Signore più vólte se le fece vedere nella S. Comunione in forma di Bambino." —P. 249.

The Saviour appeared to her as the Divine Saviour, and placed a diamond ring upon her finger in the form of a heart, in token of her being his spouse, which had a paradisaical splendour, and contained five diamonds, as a sign of the five wounds of Christ.

Witness, Adm. Rev. P. F. Aloysius, Maria a Jesu Sacerdos, professus ordinis Minor S. Petri de Alcantara, Lector, Definitor, Visitator, ac Missionarius Apostolicus: "Finalmente soggiungo due singolarissime finezze racconte dalla serva di Dio in occasione del Santo Presepio per traduzione del Padre Felice suo confessore al Padre Salvadore, conferma-

tomi poi Da Suor Maria Felice,* e da Suor Teodora Tipaldi, che ne stavano intese (averli). La prima fu l'aver avuto nella notte di S. Natale avanti detto Presepio dal divin Salvatore visibilmente apparsole, l' anello celeste in segno dello sposalizio fatto con Jesu Christo, quale anello mostrato venne allora dalla Serva di Dio a detta sua Compagna; ma questa non lo vidde affatto, dicendole con la sua solita semplicita, che tramandava uno splendore di Paradiso, ed era formato a cuore con 5 diamanti in segno delle 5 piaghe di Jesu Christo, raccontandole ancora il grazioso colloquio tenuto con D. Salvadore, che visibilmente apparsole le disse, 'Eccomi sposa mia, gia son venuto, che mi vuoi dare?' Ed ella rispose, Signore io sono una povera di corpo e di anima, voi potete darmi tutto e farmi vostra sposa. Ed allora il divin Salvadore le pose in dito il detto anello, seco sposandola con amor singolarissimo. Il detto anello fu portato dalla serva di Dio per lo spazio di 8 giorni, cioè per tutta l' ottava del S. Natale."—P. 208.

She is blasphemously said to have had imparted to her the sufferings of Christ, his bloody sweat, the anguish of the crown of thorns, his scourgings and his agonies on the cross, and to have had his wounds visibly impressed upon her. It is stated that whilst enduring the agonies of the cross (p. 215), she was in contortions, with her arms stretched out; that her limbs trembled; that small streaks of blood dropped from her hair; that her head was languid, turning first on one side and then on the other side, and sometimes falling on her chest; that her eyes were darkened and without meaning, and that her face was pallid, and with a death-like sweat.

Witness, Adm. Rev. P. F. Aloysius, Maria a Jesu

*Her Director. Thus we find three priests and two nuns giving circulation to and evidencing this fable.

Sacerdos ordinis Minor S. Petri de Alcantara, Lector, Definitor, Visitator, ac Missionarius Apostolicus.

After describing how she was loaded by the Saviour with an invisible cross, and describing her tortures in her feet, the above witness proceeds to state how, on every Friday, she partook of the most holy wounds, and all the mysteries of Christ's passion. "In questo luogo mi costa quanto ersica e sublime sia stata la fede e la divozione della serva di Dio verso la passione di Gesu Christo dai singolari doni e privilegi che ne riportò mentre in tutti i Venerdi dell' anno, e specialmente in tempo di Quaresima il Signore le partecipò le sue sagratissime Piaghe, e tutti i misteri della sua passione, come si ave per tradizione del P. Felice di lei confessore, del P. Salvadore di lei direttore, oltre di che mi è stato contestato ancora dalla più volte nominata una Compagna Suor Maria Felice, e da Suor Teodora Tipaldi, che ne sono testimoni oculari e Cominciavano le dette Piaghe a comparire nelle di lei mani sui dal Giovedì dopo vespro come una rosetta, o un carboncó, secondo, la loro espressione, le quali poi o poco apoco, si dilotavano finestre nel Venerdi sequente comparivano nelle piante della mani di sotto, e di sopra come fossero squarciate da un grosso perno, o sia chiodo. Da una sua commandre per noma Giovanna Peccerillo, donna Scaltra, pia, e divota confidente della serva di Dio, ora decrepita, mi fu ancora raccontato d' aver' ella veduto co' propri occhi in un Venerdì di Marzo, come pativa la crocifissione, avendola osservata distesa sul letto colle braccia aperte contorcersi, e dimenarsi, tremando in tutte le membre, le dita delle mani aggrinzersi in maniera come se fossero realmente inchiodate; dalli capelli grondare strisce di sangue, il capo languido, girandolo ora destra, ora a sinistra ed or abandonarlo sul petto, gli occhi eclissati e stupidi, la faccia impallidita, e con un sudor di morte."—P. 215.

Afterwards he relates that she had a copious sweating of blood (p. 216), and that the Saviour communicated to her the wound in the side of his breast.

Such are the miracles related in support of priestcraft, purgatory, the veneration of images, and the sanctity of one of the veriest of fanatics, and such are a few more of those miracles which an eminent authority says are antecedently as credible as the miracles recorded in the New Testament, and which of course he receives as miracles on the highest possible ecclesiastical authority. In fact, as he says, he finds it impossible to resist the evidence of them.

The next interesting batch of miracles I shall quote are those of St. Dominick, another distinguished saint of the Church of Rome, taken from 'Bollandi Acta Sanctorum. tom. i. p. 401. De S. Dominico confessore die quartâ Augusti.'

"Firmioribus testimoniis roboratur prodigium circa hæc tempora patratum, quod venerabilis Humbertus in vitâ S. Dominici, c. 44, distincte narrat, et quod apud nos in Ultrajectino ejusdem vitæ apographo sic sonat. 'Cum aliquando apud castrum, quod dicitur Fanum-Jovis, in prædicatione quâdam idem beatus Dominicus, fidem probans Catholicam, hæreticorum perfidiam multipliciter improbasset, post prædicationem more solito in ecclesiâ ad orationem remansit. Et ecce novem matronæ nobiles ex eodem castro intrantes ecclesiam, ad pedes ejus procidérunt dicentes, "Serve Dei, adjuva nos. Si vera sunt, quæ hodie prædicasti, jam diu mentes nostras erroris spiritus excæcavit; nam istis, quos tu hæreticos vocas, nos autem bonos homines appellamus, usque in

"A prodigy performed about this time is confirmed by stronger testimonies, which the venerable Humbert, in his life of St. Dominick, c. 44, clearly relates, and which is thus given in the Utrecht memoir of his life. 'When the same blessed Dominick, in proving the Catholic faith, had attacked the perfidy of the heretics in various ways near the castle called the Temple of Jupiter, he remained as usual in the church in prayer after preaching. Behold, nine noble ladies, entering the church from the same castle, threw themselves at his feet, saying, "Servant of God, help us. If these things be true which you have this day preached, the spirit of error has long enough blinded our eyes, for those whom you call heretics, we call good men, and to this day have believed and followed

hodiernum diem credidimus, et adhæsimus toto corde. Nunc autem in medio fluctuamus. Serve Dei, adjuva nos, et ora Dominum Deum tuum, ut notam nobis faciat fidem suam, in quâ vivamus; moriamur, et salvemur."'—P. 228.

"Tunc vir Dei stans aliquandiu, et intra semetipsum orans, post aliquantulum dixit eis, 'Constantes estote et exspectate intrepide; confido in Domino Deo meo, quod ipse, qui neminem vult perire, jam ostendet vobis, quali domino hactenus adhæsistis.' Statimque viderunt de medio sui catum (al. cattum *in margin*) unum teterrimum prosilire, qui magni canis præferens quantitatem, habebat grossos oculos et flammantes, linguam longam latamque atque sanguinolentam protractam usque ad umbilicum; caudam vero habens curtam sursumque protensam, posteriorum turpitudinem, quocumque se verteret, ostendebat, de quibus fœtor intolerabilis exhalabat. Cumque circa matronas illas se per aliquam horam huc illucque vertisset, ad chordam, ex quâ campana pendebat, exsiliens, et per eam usque ad superiora conscendens, tandem per campanile lapsus disparuit, fœda post se vestigiâ derelinquens. Conversus autem ad matronas illas vir Dei Dominicus, et consolans eas, 'Ecce,' inquit, 'per hoc, quod coram oculis vestris, faciente Deo, figurative comparuit, potestis advertere, qualis est ille, cui hactenus sequentes hæreticos servivistis.' Illæ vero gratias Deo referentes ab illâ horâ ad fidem Catholicam sunt conversæ, quarum heartily. Now, however, we are perplexed. Servant of God, help us, and pray to the Lord your God that he would reveal to us his faith, in which we may live, die, and be saved."'

"Then the man of God, standing some time, and praying within himself, after a little, said to them, 'Be steadfast and expect with confidence; I believe in the Lord my God, who desires none to perish, that he will show you what a master you have followed.' Instantly they saw leap from the midst of them a very black cat, as big as a large dog, with huge and flashing eyes, with a long, broad, and bloody tongue thrust out and extending to the middle of his body, but with a short tail turned upwards, so that whatever way he turned he showed posteriorum turpidinem, from which proceeded a most intolerable smell. And after showing himself to these ladies for an hour, he leaped up along the bell-rope, and climbing by it he ascended to the roof of the house, and disappeared as it he had fallen from the belfry, leaving foul traces behind him. Dominick, the man of God, turning to these ladies and comforting them said, 'Behold, by this which has typically appeared before your eyes, God doing it, you may see what he is whom you have obeyed in following the heretics.' These noble ladies, after giving thanks to God, turned to the Catholic faith, and some of them took the habit of religion among the Sisters de Prulianno. In like manner also Humbert diligently

etiam aliquæ apud Sorores de Pruliano religionis habitum assumpserunt. Vero similiter Humbertus istud miraculum diligenter examinavit, quandoquidem illud distinctiori modo, quam alii scriptores, posteritati reliquit."

"Hinc facile fidem adhibemus iis, quæ Echardus tomo i. bibli prædicat, pp. 6 et 7, ex monumentis ejusdem monasterii ita profert, 'Novem nobiles matrones, Fani-Jovis incolæ, prædicatione et exemplis Sancti Patris ab hæresi conversæ sunt per miraculum, quod viderunt, dæmonis, sub formâ bestiæ egredientis, in tempore quo vir Dei concionem finivit: quarum una, nomine Berengaria, in inquisitione factâ pro sancti viri canonizatione, dictum miraculum, a se visum, cum juramento testata est.'"

"Dein Echardus ex iisdem monasterii monumentis has fœminas conversas ita nominat: 'Harum novem nomina hæc sunt ex iisdem actis. Sorores Audacia, Raymunda Passarina, Berengaria, Richarda, Barbairana Jordana, Guillelmina de Belloponte, Curtolana, Raymunda Claretta, Gentiana, quæ domum qualemcunque ad sacellum beatæ Virginis Prulianum constructum intrarunt die Sanctæ Cæciliæ, xxii Novembris, et die S. Johannis evangelistæ sequenti, xxvii Decembris, 1206, sub clave deinceps non egressuræ clausæ fuerunt. His paulo post duæ se adjunxere Manenta et Guillelmina de Fano-Jovis, quam ultimam beatus Dominicus Priorissam constituit.'"—P. 230.

investigated the miracle, and at the same time has handed it down to posterity in a clearer manner than other writers."

"Hence we readily give credit to those things which Echard in his first volume, pages 6 and 7, adduces from the monuments of the same Church, saying, 'Nine noble ladies, inhabitants of the Temple of Jupiter, were converted by the preaching and examples of the holy father, by means of a miracle which they saw of the devil escaping in the likeness of a beast, after the man of God had finished his sermon; one of whom, named Berengaria, at the inquisition summoned for the canonization of the holy man, testified on oath that she saw it.'"

"Moreover, Echard gives the names of these converted women from the same monuments, thus: 'These are the names of the nine, taken from the same sources: Sisters Audacia, Raymunda Passarina, Berengaria, Richarda, Barbairana Jordana, Guillelmina de Bellopointe, Curtolana, Raymunda Claretta, Gentiana; all of whom entered the building, which was constructed as the Prulian Chapel of the blessed Virgin, on St. Cecilia's day, November the 22nd; and on St. John the Evangelist's day following, December the 27th, 1206, they were irrevocably confined under lock and key. Shortly after these things, two of them, Manenta and Guillelmina of Jupiter's Temple, joined this society, and the blessed Dominick made the latter the Prioress.'"

From 'Acta Sanctorum Bollandi, mensis Augusti,' tom. i. die quartâ, I copy additional facts:

* * * "Alia nonnulla, quæ Sanctus in hâc commoratione Romanâ gessisse dicitur."

"Gerardus de Fracheto in Vitis Fratrum, par. 2. c. 14, de sancto suo fundatore refert sequentia: 'Cum quâdam nocte vir sanctus in oratione prostratus jaceret, diabolus invidens ei, de tecto ecclesiæ lapidem magnum projecit tam fortiter juxta eum, ut per totam ecclesiam sonitum faceret, ut scilicet eum ab orationis instantiâ deturbaret. Venit autem lapis tam prope, ut etiam tangeret caputium cappæ ejus. Cumque vir sanctus immobilis in oratione persisteret, diabolus mox voce terribili ejulans confusus abscessit.'"—§ 565.

"Theodoricus de Appaldia apud nos, num. 171, haud dubio ex hoc spicilegio Gerardi eamdem rem excerpsit, et quamvis locus non exprimatur, tamen scriptores Dominicarii communiter tradunt, id Romæ in ecclesiâ S. Sabina accidisse."

"Quapropter Malvenda in Annalibus ad annum Christi 1218, c. 35, opportune nos ita monet, 'Pompeius Ugonius libro de Stationibus Urbis, statione prima auctor est, marmor illud pavimenti, ictu saxi a dæmone jacti, in diversas partes scissum et conquassatum, ad annum 1586 mansisse omnibus conspicuum, signum miraculi retinens. Sed eo anno, dejecto mediano pariete, qui ecclesiam intersecabat, uti superius diximus, et instaurato pavimento, jussu Xisti Pontificis Maximi, qui eam ecclesiam illustrandam curabat, mercenarii,

"Gerard de Fracheto, in his Lives of the Brethren, par. 2. c. 14, relates the following concerning his founder: 'When the holy man lay prostrate in prayer one night, the devil, envying him, threw at him a great stone so violently that it reverberated throughout the whole church, evidently in order to disturb the earnestness of his devotion. The stone came so near that it hit the top of his cowl. And when the holy man remained immovable in prayer, the confounded devil fled howling fearfully.'"

...

"Theodore of Appaldia, num. 171, without expressing a doubt about it, selects the same account from Gerard's collection; and although the spot where it took place is not specified, still the Dominican writers generally state that it occurred in St. Sabine's Church at Rome."

"Accordingly, Malvenda, in his Annals of the year 1218, c. 35, seasonably advises us, 'Pompeius Ugonius, in his book concerning the Stations of the City, in his first station tells us, that the marble pavement was split and shattered into fragments by the blow of the devil's stone, and remained visible to all, and retained the evidence of the miracle till 1586. But the middle wall of the church having been thrown down that year, as we have related above, and the pavement having been repaired by order of Pope Xistus, the

operæ nihil minus curantes, marmor illud fractum amoverunt, veteremque illam miraculi memoriam dissiparunt.' "—§ 567.

"Deinde laudatus Pompeius, fol. 15, suggerit Italice posteriorem memorati saxi notitiam, quam Malvenda in Annalibus loco proxime citato sic fere Latinam reddit: 'Nunc saxum ipsum, quod dæmon in sanctum Dominicum jecit, in medio ecclesiæ supra columnellam bicubitalem positum revinctumque catenâ ferreâ, ne quis auferat, visitur, quod nos sæpe conspeximus. Est nigri coloris, rotundum, et, ut remur, ponderis quinquaginta librarum existimamus esse ex vetustis Romanorum ponderibus; nam multos hujus usus consimiles lapides Romæ vidimus.' "—§ 568.

careless mercenary workmen removed the broken marble, and thus destroyed the ancient record of the miracle.' "

"Afterwards the illustrious Pompeius gives in Italian the latest notice of the memorable stone, which Malvenda, in the last cited place, thus translates into Latin: 'Now is seen the very stone which the devil threw at Dominic, placed above a column two cubits high in the midst of the church, and fastened with an iron chain to prevent its removal, which we have often seen. It is of a black colour, round, and as we calculate, about fifty pounds weight, according to the old Roman measure; for we have seen many similar stones at Rome.' "

'Bollandi Acta Sanctorum, tom. i. De S. Dominico confessore, die quartâ Augusti.'

"Adest igitur dies celebris ut translatio eximii doctoris celebretur, &c. accedit pia episcoporum devotio, accedunt et alii. . . . . Ablato siquidem lapide, cœpit odor quidam mirificus ex foramine exhalare, cujus fragrantiâ adstantes attoniti mirabantur, quid esset. Removeri jubent capsæ tabulam; et ecce apotheca unguentorum, paradisus aromatum, hortus rosarum, campus liliorum et violarum, ac omnium florum suavitas victa perhibetur. Bononia quondam quod plaustra ingredientia tetrum odorem fundant adveniente rota fœtore perfunditur; dum gloriosi Dominici sepulchrum panditur, odore omnium aromatum suavitate vincente, purificata exhilaratur. Stupent qui aderant et

"Therefore, forasmuch as the day has come for celebrating the departure of the excellent doctor, &c., the bishops and others came. . . . . On removing the stone, a wonderful odour was emitted from the entrance, the fragrance of which excited the wonder and admiration of the bystanders, as to what it was. They ordered the top of the coffin to be removed, and lo! an apothecary's shop of ointments, a paradise of aromatics, a garden of roses, a field of lilies and violets, and the sweetness of every flower, is emitted and excelled. Once Boulogne was inundated with a bad smell, owing to the arrival of wagons which gave it out; but while the grave of the glorious Dominick was opened,

stupore perterriti cadunt. Hinc ruunt dulces flatus, miscentur et gaudia; timor et spes in campo animæ consurgunt, moventque bella mirifica, mirifici odoris suavitatem sentientes. Sensimus et nos hujus odoris dulcedinem, et quæ vidimus et sensimus, hæc testamur; nunquam enim, licet diutius juxta corpus eloquii portitoris sancti Dominici studiose steterimus, poteramus tanto dulco satiari. Dulcor ille fastidium expellebat, devotionem ingerebat, miracula suscitabat. Si manu, si cingulo, si aliqua re tangebatur corpus, per tempus prolixum odor ille permanebat. Delatum est corpus ad monumentum marmoreum, cum propriis aromatibus ibidem recondendum. Spirabat odor mirificus ex corpore sancto, ostendens cunctis dilucide, quam bonus Christi odor hic esset."

the odour of all his aromatics gained the upper hand by their sweetness. Those that are present are astonished, and fall to the ground. From this place sweet gales proceed, and pleasures are communicated: hope and fear of soul arise in this field, and extraordinary contests of feeling are excited in those who are sensible of the sweetness of the wonderful odour. And these things which we testify, we saw and were sensible of. . . . . The sweetness itself cast out pride, produced devotion, provoked marvels. If the body were touched with the hand, with the girdle, or with any other thing, such thing retained the odour for some time. The body was conveyed to a marble monument, with proper spices. A wonderful odour arose from the sacred body, showing evidently in every way that he was the good odour of Christ."

Are these signs and wonders, so solemnly and so authentically given, from the same mint as the miracles of Jesus? Are they, in any sense, credible? Is not the narrative alone disproof of their truth—demonstration of imposture, not inspiration—of lying wonders, not holy miracles? We might expect them as antecedently credible respecting the "man of sin," but in no respect credible as credentials or acts of the Son of God. Yet they are accepted by the Church of Rome as vital elements of her decision to canonize the workers of them. What sort of a saint was the ruthless savage Dominick, inciting the foundation of the Inquisition? What kind of a saint was Gregory VII., an ambitious priest attempting at any cost to subject Europe to the See of Rome! What title to saintship had Thomas à Becket, a rebel to his king,

and a traitor to his country! What saintship was there in Pius V., who burned more heretics than most of his predecessors, excommunicated Queen Elizabeth, and incited her subjects to rebellion! Some of those saints whose miracles we have quoted, were fanatics, some were fools, and others, I fear, were knaves. Their so-called miracles are lying legends, not deeds to bereceived as the works of the omnipotence of God.

The next story, respecting St. Laurentius, is taken from 'Historiæ Ecclesiasticæ gentis Anglorum, lib. v., a venerabili Bedâ presbytero scriptæ, &c. Cantabrigiæ, 1644.'

"Cum vero Laurentius, Mellitum Justumque secuturus, ac Britanniam esset relicturus, jussit ipsa sibi nocte in Ecclesiâ beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli, de quâ frequenter jam diximus, stratum parari: in quo cum post multas preces ac lacrymas ad Deum pro statu Ecclesiæ fusas, ad quiescendum membra posuisset, atque obdormisset, apparuit ei beatissimus Apostolorum princeps, et multo illum tempore secretæ noctis flagellis acrioribus afficiens, sciscitabatur Apostolicâ districtione, quare gregem, quem sibi ipse crediderat, relinqueret, vel cui oves Christi in medio luporum positas fugiens ipse demitteret?"

"When Laurentius, being about to follow Mellitum and Justus, was going to leave Britain, he ordered a bed to be prepared for him in the Church of the blessed Apostles Peter and Paul, of which we have already spoken. In which, after pouring out many prayers and tears before God for the state of the Church, when he had composed himself to rest and fallen asleep, the most blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, appeared to him, and scourged him with sharp whips frequently in the secret night, and asked him with apostolic severity, why he left the flock committed to him, or why, abandoning the sheep of Christ amidst wolves, he should himself run away."

In other words, this credible miracle is the record that the Apostle Peter came down to a saint in the midst of the night, seized a whip, and scourged him so severely, that the bruises were visible the next day.

"An mei, inquit, oblitus es exempli qui pro parvulis Christi, quos mihi in indicium suæ dilec-

"Are you not forgetful, said he, of my example, who for Christ's tender lambs, which

tionis commendaverat, vincula, verbera, carceres, afflictiones, ipsam postremo mortem autem crucis, ab infidelibus et inimicis Christi, ipse cum Christo coronandus pertuli? His beati Petri flagellis simul et exhortationibus animatus famulus Christi Laurentius mox mane facto venit ad regem, et relicto vestimento, quantis esset verberibus laceratus ostendit. Qui multum miratus et inquirens, quis tanto viro tales ausus esset plagas infligere, ut audivit quia causa suæ salutis Episcopus ab apostolo Christi tanta esset tormenta plagasque perpessus, extimuit multum, atque anathematizato omni idololatriæ cultu, abdicato connubio non legitimo, suscepit fidem Christi, et baptizatus ecclesiæ rebus quantum valui in omnibus consulere ac favere curavit."

he commended to me in token of his love, endured patiently bonds, stripes, imprisonments, afflictions, and lastly even death itself? but the cross to which I was nailed by infidels and enemies of Christ, was to me only the preparation to my being crowned with Christ. The servant of God, stirred up by these exhortations and scourgings, went to the king in the morning, and taking off his shirt showed him with what heavy scourgings he had been torn. The astonished king demanded who had dared to administer such stripes on so great a man; but as soon as he learned that it was for his salvation that the Bishop was so beaten and scourged by the Apostle of Christ, he was afraid, and abandoning all idolatry, and giving up an improper connubial relationship, he embraced the faith of Christ, and being baptized, made himself useful in the things of the church, and always took care to study its welfare, and to befriend it."

And this miracle of the Apostle Peter coming down in the night, and exercising a whip upon the shoulders of a saint, is thought to be as credible as the miracles of the New Testament!

Other miracles are those of St. Teresias, who died owing to the intolerable fire of divine love which consumed her.

The Bull of Canonization of Teresias, who died A. D. 1580, and was canonized in the year 1620 by Gregory XV., I take from the 'Bullarium Magnum Romanum.' "Gregorius Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, &c. Omnipotens, sermo Dei, &c."

"Aliquando etiam Angelum vidit ignito jaculo sibi præcordia transverberantem, ex quibus cœlestibus donis divini amoris flammâ in ejus corde adeo exæstuabat, ut maxime arduum votum a Deo edocta emiserit, efficiendi semper quicquid perfectius esse et ad majorem Dei gloriam pertinere intelligeret. Quinetiam post mortem cuidam moniali per visum manifestavit, se non vi morbi, sed ex intolerabili divini amoris incendio vita excessisse."

"Sometimes, also, she saw an angel piercing her entrails with a burning dart, from which divine gifts she so burned with the flame of divine love, that she emitted the most arduous vow to do always whatever she might understand to be more perfect, and to the greater glory of God. Also after her death she revealed in a vision, to a certain monk, that she died not by the violence of disease, but by the insufferable burning of divine love."

St. Maria Magdalena de Pazzi bathed her hands and arms in cold water, and drank most copiously of it under the influence of divine love to cool the Ætna within her, as will appear from her Bull of Canonization. 'Bullarium Magnum Romanum.' She died A.D. 1607, and was canonized by Clement X., A.D. 1670.

"Præterea cum æterno Patre eodem anno admirandum habuit colloquium de modo adornandi animam ante sumptionem sanctissimæ Eucharistiæ; atque his profusæ in se divinitatis muneribus ad illud amoris incendium evasit, ut interdum exclamaret, 'O amor, te amplius ferre non possum. Amor in te revertere; tanti amoris incapax ego sum.' Exinde ad gelidum fontem vel ad putei crepidinem manus et brachia undis mergebat, easdem potabat avidissime, marium copiosâ aspergine pectoris Ætnam refrigerabat."

"Moreover, she had with the eternal Father in the same year a valuable discourse as to the manner of preparing the soul before partaking of the most holy Eucharist; and from these gifts of a profuse divinity in herself, she rose to that heat of love that she exclaimed, 'O love, I cannot bear it longer. O love, retire into thyself, I am not capable of so great love.' Then she went to a fountain or well, and dipt her arms and hands in water, and drank most greedily, and cooled the Ætna of her soul with copious ablutions."

Conceive a person having such love in her heart, that, love within being capable of being cooled by water applied without, she is obliged to bathe in

cold water, and drink copiously of it, in order to cool its fervour!

"Continuavit etiam suavissimi odoris ex singulis membris, sed præcipue et acutius ex stomacho, fragrantia tam mira suaveolentia, ut ei nec liquorum, nec florum, aut aromatum odores comparari queant; adeo ut plurium medicorum assertione et testimonio constet, non nisi divinitus prodire ex illo virgineo corpusculo talem fragrantiam, quæ adhuc longe suavius emanavit cum anno Domini millesimo sexcentesimo sexagesimo tertio pro solemni canonizatione exaratus fuit processus." —Ibid.

"There continued also the fragrance of the sweetest scent from all her limbs, but most perceptibly and acutely from her stomach such a sweetness of scent, that neither the odours of liqueurs, nor flowers, nor aromatics could be compared to it; so much so, that it is evident, from the assertion and testimony of medical men, that such an odour could not emanate from her virgin body, unless by divine power, which only the more sweetly issued in 1663, when the process for her solemn canonization was begun."

This scent therefore lasted fifty-six years.

Lewis of Claremont, who had lost his sense of smelling from the time he was sixteen years old, recovered it through the sweet odour which emanated from the corpse of St. Raymond of Pennafort, as will appear from the following extract from the 'Bullarium Magnum Romanum.' This saint died A.D. 1275. He was canonized by Clement VIII. A.D. 1601.

"Clemens Episcopus, servus servorum Dei, &c. Romana Catholica Ecclesia, &c.

"Anno itidem. millesimo quingentesimo nonagesimo sexto, cum judices constituti ad explorandas beati hujus viri reliquias, arcam ubi erant reconditæ aperuissent, tantus illico odor ex ejus corpore, qui vivens in odorem suavitatis Deo se consecraverat, exhalavit, ut multi qui eo confluxerant, nihil eo percipi posse jucundius affirmarent; quinimo egregius vir Ludovicus de Claremont ex gravi morbo sensu

"Clement, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, &c.

"Likewise in the year 1659, when the judges who were appointed to examine the remains of this blessed man, opened the tomb where they were buried, immediately so great an odour was exhaled from the body of him, who whilst living had consecrated himself as a sweet savour unto God, that many who flocked to the place declared that nothing sweeter could be conceived; and, what is more,

odoratus a sexdecim annis orbatus, cum in eâ hominum multitudine videndi desiderio incitatus, propius accessisset, eum etiam odorem suavissimum sensit; quo repente ita recreatus est, ut lachrymas præ gaudio continere, nec ullam vocem emittere ullo modo posset; verum tacitus apud se cogitans dubitabat, cum istius solummodo odoris olfactum recuparesset, an etiam rerum aliarum. Sed domum reversus, ubi se varios odores percipere animadvertit, miraculum subitn evulgavit."

when that eminent man, Lewis of Claremont, who had been deprived by a severe disease of his sense of smell from the age of sixteen, attracted by curiosity, approached the place with the multitude, he also smelt the delightful odour; by which he was so suddenly cured, that he shed tears of joy, and was unable to speak; but wondered in silent thought whether he had only recovered his sense of smell as far as this odour was concerned, or whether it was completely restored to him. But on returning to his home, and discovering that he could perceive various odours, he immediately proclaimed the miracle."

This scent lasted, therefore, three hundred and twenty-one years.

The late Dr. Wiseman edited a book called 'Lives of St. Alphonsus Liguori, St. Francis de Girolamo, St. John Joseph of the Cross, St. Pacificus of San Severino, and St. Veronica Giuliani, whose canonization took place on Trinity Sunday, May 26th, 1839.'

In the life of St. Joseph of the Cross, he describes the furniture of his cell (p. 144)—"A rough seat and a table, a bed, consisting of two narrow planks, with two sheepskins and a wretched woollen coverlet, a stool to rest his wounded legs upon; these, with his Breviary, formed the whole furniture of his cell." There is no mention of that book which one would have thought would certainly have been in a minister's cell, known by the name of the Bible. "In reward for his virginal purity, which he preserved unspotted from his baptism, as his confessor afterwards attested, God caused his person," says Dr. Wiseman, "in spite of his age, infirmities, and constant sores, to diffuse a sweet and delicious perfume."

Again, he says this saint had the "custom of frequently kissing the hands of priests." But here is a very remarkable instance of his want of sincerity, —"Not unfrequently he desired those whom he restored to health, to take some certain medicine, that the cure might be attributed to a mere natural remedy." In other words, he concealed his miracles by lies. He was so modest, that he lied rather than expose himself to praise. If it was a miracle, he should have said so; if it was not a miracle, he should have admitted it; but to have it here recorded as a miracle, and the saint, knowing it was a miracle, out of humility desiring the recipient to say the cure resulted from medicine, is to invest the saint with the faculty of telling lies as well as the power of doing miracles.

Next he describes St. Veronico Giuliani. At p. 247 he tells us: "God recompensed her readiness to drink the chalice of sufferings, by making her a partaker of the torments of his passion. On the 4th of April, 1649, as near as can be ascertained, he appeared to her, and presented her with his crown of thorns. In obedience to her confessor, she thus describes her vision: 'On the 4th of April, whilst I was in prayer during the night, I fell into a reverie, and in it had an intellectual vision, wherein our Lord appeared to me, with a large crown of thorns upon his head. Immediately I cried out, "My Spouse, give me a part of these thorns; I deserve them, not thou, my Sovereign Good." I heard him reply, "I am now come to crown thee, my beloved;" and then he took the crown off his head, and placed it upon mine. The pain I suffered, at that instant, was so excessive, that I have never, as far as I can understand, suffered anything like it. It is true, that at that time it was made known to me, that this crowning was a manifest sign that I was to be

espoused to the Lord; and that, for this reason, he wished me to share in all his torments, so that I might be called the spouse of God crucified, and therefore I also was to be crucified with my divine spouse.'" This is Dr. Wiseman's record of what she said, and he gives it as a model of what we are to imitate, instead of that of the saints in the New Testament, who are to be followed as they followed Christ. She proceeds, as stated by Dr. Wiseman, to say: "'Every thorn that I felt in my head was a fresh invitation to me. On the same day, I was promised all the renewals of this crowning. But it seemed to me that such suffering was a great joy to me; I felt as if I should die, if I had not some torment to undergo.'"

In another part of this volume, (p. 251), Dr. Wiseman records her sayings: "'While I was one morning at mass, suddenly an *application* came upon me. During the course of it, I felt certain touches in my heart, which excited me to a strong desire of uniting myself wholly to God. On a sudden it seems to me that God took me out of my senses, and, by communication, gave me to know, *ab intra*, that he wished to be espoused to me. This news made my heart leap anew, and I felt it burning within me. With this excitement was displayed to me all that I was to do in order to make due preparation for it; and in this interval I received light to know that all this preparation was to be of pure suffering.' She protests," says Dr. Wiseman, "that after this vision, the simple words, 'My Divine Jesus, spouse of my soul,' filled her heart with indescribable joy, and that she went on repeating them, like a rosary, the same number of times that the angelical salutation is therein repeated. She adds," says Dr. Wiseman, "that, in inviting her to His marriage, Jesus frequently appeared in the form of a beautiful infant; and on the Feast of the Circumcision, 1694, intimated to her that

her preparation for it was to be by all kinds of sufferings. During the month of March, she was troubled with great desolation and spiritual dryness. But on the twenty-seventh of that month, our Lord comforted her by showing her with what delight He looked upon a beautiful jewel, fixed in the wound of His sacred side; and telling her that it had been formed of all the sufferings she had undergone for his sake. She offered herself," says Dr. Wiseman, "anew to be crucified with Him, and He seemed to stoop down and embrace her soul, giving it a kiss of love. 'When we return to ourselves,' she concludes, 'after these communications, we understand, in the most lively manner, the value of suffering, and the treasure which lies concealed amid contempt, disgrace, and humiliations. These are the lessons to be learned in this school of divine love.' Two days previous," says Dr. Wiseman, "on the Feast of the Annunciation, our blessed Lady was pleased to prepare her for her espousals. This was by an intellectual vision, as she calls such in her writings, wherein she beheld the great Queen of Angels upon a magnificent throne, accompanied by St. Catharine of Sienna, and St. Rose of Lima," of whom I have given you some specimens. "To their prayer, that she would consent to the espousal of her servant with her divine Son, our Lady sweetly replied, that they should be brought about. Veronica," says Dr. Wiseman, "saw in her hands a beautiful ring, intended, she was told, for her. 'And then, turning to these saints,' she adds, 'it seemed to me that our Lady told me that I must imitate them in the most heroic virtues, especially in humility, charity, and knowledge of myself. As she said this, it seemed to me that she communicated these virtues to me *ab intra*, and the precious treasure that lies hid in them..... From that day till now, I have been, as it were, out of myself, and I have ever had

this intimate presence of God.' During Lent," says Dr. Wiseman, "she practised the most cruel mortifications and austerities; and on Holy Saturday—which in that year fell upon the tenth of April—our Lord appeared to her; and showing her the nuptial ring; invited her to His marriage on the following day. As a proof of the reality of these supernatural visions, let the reader," says Dr. Wiseman, "observe their effects. 'Here it was again made known to me,' she writes, 'that for this purpose a complete renewal of my soul was required. It seemed to me that our Lord gave me a new rule of living with greater austerity; of greater silence; of working with greater fervour and love; of doing all things with purity of intention, and in His honour of refusing to gratify any natural inclination, and embracing quite the opposite; of flying human praises, and loving contempt and mortification; of being in all things a lover of the cross, and to hold it in my hand as a strong shield of defence; of being crucified in everything, and of labouring to attain all that is of the highest perfection.' During the night," says Dr. Wiseman, "she had three visions; in the first of which Jesus seemed to enter her heart, and to cast out of it what the saint, in her humility, calls 'earthly things, begrimed with self-love, and disgusting to the smell,—such as human respects, and all imperfections that could impede my advancement.' In the two following visions," says Dr. Wiseman, "He seemed to adorn her soul with rich furniture, which He told her were His own divine merits, given to her as her dowry. When the time of communion arrived, she felt herself more than ever inflamed with heavenly love. As she approached the altar, she heard the angels singing in sweetest melody, *Veni Sponsa Christi;* then, being rapt out of her senses, she beheld two magnificent thrones;

that on the right hand, of gold, decorated with the most splendid jewels, whereupon was seated our blessed Lord, with his wounds shining brighter than the sun; the other formed of alabaster of purest whiteness, and brilliant with gems, and thereupon was seated our blessed Lady, in a white mantle of surpassing richness, who besought her Son to hasten His marriage. Innumerable were the multitudes of the heavenly court, in the midst whereof were the holy virgins, St. Catharine and St. Rose, the former of whom intimated to Veronica what she was to do in that most august solemnity. They conducted her slowly to the thrones, and at the foot thereof put upon her, over her religious habit, various robes; each surpassing the other in splendour. As she approached the throne of Christ, whose garments she knows not, she says, how to describe, she beheld in each of His wounds a beautiful gem, but from that in His side, which was open, rays more bright than the sun darted on every side. In it she seemed to perceive the nuptial ring. When He raised up His hand to bless her, He intoned the words, *Veni Sponsa Christi;* and our Lady, with the whole court, taking them up, continued, *Accipe coronam, quam tibi Dominus præparavit in æternum.* St. Catharine then took off her rich attire, leaving only her religious habit, to show, the saint intimates, its value in the eyes of God, being allowed to appear in that glorious assembly. After remaining in this dress for a short time, our Lord made a sign to His blessed mother to clothe her with the nuptial garment. It was a magnificent mantle, covered with gems, and appeared of different colours. Our Lady gave it to St. Catharine, who put it upon Veronica, and placed her between the two thrones. Then, feeling herself more than ever pierced with love, she saw our Lord take the ring out of His side, and give it to the mother. 'This

ring,' she writes, 'shone with splendour. It appeared to me to be made of gold, but all wrought in enamel, which formed in the stone the name of the good Jesus. . . . . From time to time I gave looks of love towards my Lord, and seemed to address Him, urging Him to come to the espousals.' The heavenly queen," says Dr. Wiseman, "commanded her to stretch out her hand to St. Catharine, which Jesus took, 'and at that moment,' she writes, 'I felt myself united more closely than ever with Him. Together with Mary ever blessed, He placed the ring upon my finger, and then blessed it.' In that instant," says Dr. Wiseman, "heaven again resounded with the songs of the angelic choir, after which her Divine Spouse gave her new rules of perfection, which were, she tells us, to remain wholly dead to her own will, and to live as if there were nothing else in the world but Himself and her own soul; that she should increase her fasting and be more rigorous in her mortifications, and crucified in everything. During this He told her He would be entirely hers. Thus ended," continues Dr. Wiseman, "this mystic ceremony of her espousals; all of which she saw, she informs us, with the eyes of the soul, not of the body. She adds, that nearly at every communion the same marriage was renewed; and that the ring remained upon her finger, and on communion-days seemed to be pressed tighter round it. It was seen also by the nuns several times; and sister Mary Spaciani attests that she saw it once, during her noviciate, distinctly with her own eyes. 'It was like a circle all round the ring-finger,' to use her own words, 'at the very spot on which the ring is usually worn. Above, it was like a raised gem, of about the size of a pea, of a vermilion colour. . . . . When I addressed her, on such occasions, she never gave me an answer to the point; but the most wonderful circumstance is, that

when I looked at her hand, a few hours afterwards, the mark was gone, and the gem, in like manner, had disappeared: and then she answered every question I put to her correctly.' In the processes," says Dr. Wiseman, "two other rings are mentioned as having been given to her at the espousals, and the renewals of them,—*the ring of love, and the ring of the cross.* She received likewise another when they were renewed on Easter Day, 1697, which was enriched, according to her own account, with three gems, on one of which were engraven two hearts, joined so as to appear but one; on the other, the figure of the cross; on the third, the instruments of the Passion. The first of them, Jesus told her, indicated the union of His heart with hers; the second, His dowry of union with her soul; and the third, the remembrance she was to have of His sufferings."

Again, I will give you another extract (p. 261):— "On Christmas eve, she made an incision upon her heart in the form of a cross with a penknife. With the blood, which issued from it, she wrote a fervent protestation of love, and a dedication of her will to her infant Saviour. Four other writings, of the same kind, made during the course of that and the following year, (1697,) all breathe the same feelings of consecration of her will to Jesus, and especially of ardent charity and zeal for the salvation of her neighbours, whose mediatrix she had promised to be In one of them, she writes: 'I intend at this moment to confirm all the protestations which I have made with my own blood, and anew I make myself the mediatrix between you and sinners. Lo! I am ready to give my life and blood for the conversion of sinners, and the confirmation of the Holy Faith. O my God! with your heart, with your love, I make this invitation. O souls redeemed with the blood of

Jesus, I speak to you; O sinners, come all to the heart of Jesus, to the fountain, to the boundless sea of His love. Come, all of you, men and women, come all, leave sin; come to Jesus!' Her loving Spouse," continues Dr. Wiseman, "rewarded her constancy and love, by the wound which He made in her heart, on the feast of His blessed nativity in that year (1696). 'I seemed to see,' she writes, 'in the hand of the Holy Infant, a rod of gold, at the point of which was, as it were, a flame of fire, and at the foot, a small piece of iron, like a little lance; and He placed this rod against His own heart, and the point of the lance in my heart, and it seemed that I felt my heart pierced through and through. In an instant, I saw nothing in His hand; but full of grace and beauty He invited me to love Him, and by way of communication, He made me understand that He had bound me to Himself by a closer tie. I understood many things, but at present I do not remember them distinctly, and therefore I do not write them.' Through modesty," says Dr. Wiseman, "she abstained from looking at the wound, but she put a linen cloth upon it, which was immediately covered with blood. Her confessor ordered her to examine it, and she found it open, and observed that it was large enough to admit the blade of a good-sized knife. It was also examined by several of her companions, and confessors, as it is attested in the processes. On Good Friday, the 5th of April, 1697, she received those rich pledges of love which were vouchsafed to the seraphic St. Francis," of whom I shall give you an account presently, "St. Catharine, and other saints; for Our Lord, after having previously foretold these graces, and after displaying His mercies in other ways to her, was pleased to imprint upon her hands and feet the stigmata or wounds of His most sacred passion. These wounds were afterwards re-

newed upon several other occasions, and their reality was made known to many persons. For the Tribunal of the Holy Office at Rome, having received information thereof, ordered the bishop of the city to make an inquiry into the truth of the report. He repaired to the gate of the convent with several other ecclesiastics, who severally saw the wounds which her blessed Spouse had made. Those in the hands and feet, as Florida Cœli and other sisters attest, were on the upper side round, and about the size of a farthing, but less on the under side, deep and red when open, and covered with a thin cicatrix or crust, when closed. The wound in the left side, above the left breast, was between four and five fingers in length, and about one finger broad in the middle, growing thinner towards the two extremities, exactly like the wound of a lance." Dr. Wiseman further tells us, (at p. 265,) that "besides the chalice, and thorny crown, and five principal wounds, Jesus imparted to her, as a signal mark of His affection, a participation in all the other sufferings of His passion." Afterwards, (at p. 269,) Dr. Wiseman informs us, "Veronica foretold that twenty-four marks would be found engraven upon her heart; and, by the order of her confessor, she described the exact form and disposition of them, by cutting them out in red and white paper; and, after her death, they were found to correspond in every particular with the account and picture which she had made of them. They were as follows: a Latin cross with a C in the top of the upright piece; the centre of the transverse an F; in the right point of the transverse a V; and in the left an O. Above the cross was, on one side, a crown of thorns; on the left of which was a banner upon a staff, which passed transversely over the cross, and the flag of the banner was divided into two tongues, on the upper of which was a large I, and on the lower an *m* in running hand. At the top of the

banner was a flame, and, lower down, a hammer, a pair of pincers, a lance, and a reed with a sponge represented upon the top. On the right of the cross, beginning from above, was a small garment, to represent the seamless vest of our Lord, another flame, a chalice, two wounds, a column, three nails, a scourge, and seven swords; with the letters P. P. V. on other parts of the heart. All these marks were exactly described by her upon paper, which being compared with her heart soon after death, were found to agree in every particular. Her confessor attests that the meaning of the above letters and emblems is—the seven swords are the seven dolours of Mary; the banner, the ensign of her victories over the devil, the world, and herself; the two letters, I (J) and *m*, Jesus and Mary; C, Charity; F, Faith and Fidelity to God; O, Obedience; the two VV, Humility and the Will of God (Umiltà, and Volonta di Dio); PP, Patience and Suffering (Patire); the two flames, the love of God and her neighbour."

There are some lying wonders told concerning blessed St. Francis in an authentic work called 'Elogia in S. Patrem Franciscum,' and published at Antwerp in 1646. It contains about fifty engravings, representing different miraculous acts in the life of St. Francis. In one, for instance, he is described as a little boy, whom a nobleman recognised as an infant saint, and therefore spread his mantle before him to walk upon. At another time St. Francis kissed a leper, and thus instantly cured him of his leprosy. We have another engraving, representing him kneeling before a crucifix, from which a voice proceeds, directing him *de reparandâ ecclesiâ*, to restore the church. He is then represented as stripping himself of his clothes, and giving them to his father. Then we have a picture representing Christ giving to St. Francis, who is kneeling before him, a book, the foot-

note being to the following effect: *Orat et accipit a Christo regulam.* The Pope, according to the next engraving, approves of the book which he had received, and St. Francis is represented in the background, supporting with his hands a tottering edifice, that is, the Roman Catholic Church. We then have St. Francis appearing to the brothers of his order in a vision, in a chariot of fire drawn by two horses, the foot-note to the engraving being, *S. Franciscus apparet fratribus in curru igneo.* The next picture shows us St. Francis in his hermitage, kneeling before a wooden cross, with a death's head at his feet, and an angel advancing with a bottle and a loaf, and offering them to him. At the foot of this engraving we are told, *S. Franciscus reficitur ab angelo in eremo;* St. Francis is refreshed by an angel in a desert. In another engraving Christ is represented armed with thunderbolts, about to destroy the world, but through the prayers of the Virgin, St. Francis, and St. Dominick, his anger is appeased. The foot-note to this engraving, which is very characteristic of the whole Romish system, is as follows:—*B. virgo Christum mundo insensum placat per S. Franciscum et S. Dominicum.* The next engraving shows us St. Francis lying naked in the snow, with some roses in his hand, which he is offering to the devil, who is drawn as a lioness on her hind legs, in order to vex him; the foot-note being, *S. Franciscus insultat dæmoni proferens in hyeme rosas.* At another time, according to this book, St. Francis preached so eloquently that the beasts of the earth, the birds of the air, and the fishes of the sea came to hear him. The foot-note informs us, *S. Franciscus invitat aves, bestias, et creaturas alias ad laudem Creatoris;* and the engraving represents an owl—the bird of night—listening most attentively and appropriately to a preacher of the night like Francis. Again, there is an elephant, looking most

sagacious and devout; and also a little lamb, looking up most intellectually, even more so than the saint, and evidently smitten with admiration at his eloquence; there is also a bear in the company, also a camel, a stag, and a rabbit; and out of some water at the saint's feet two fishes are peering and raising their heads, and apparently swallowing in his words with great avidity. He is then represented being beaten by demons. Next, he is refreshed in his cell by the melody proceeding from an angel's harp. Next we are shown his central seat in heaven. In another engraving we have St. Francis and St. Clara, represented in a flame of fire, and on the ground there appear to be the remnants of a repast. By the foot-note we are informed that St. Francis and St. Clara, whilst refreshing themselves, were carried away in ecstasy, and the convent seemed on fire (*S. Franciscus et S. Clara se reficientes in extasin rapiuntur, et conventus ardere visus*). Next, he is represented in the act of restoring a dead child to life, and casting an evil spirit out of a woman. (*Infantem mortuum ad vitam revocat. Energumenum liberat.*) Another engraving represents the saint with the infant Jesus in his arms, the blessed Virgin having just presented Him to him—the foot-note being, *Beata Virgo puerum Jesum Francisco offert.* Next, he is represented as receiving a plenary indulgence from Christ through the mediation of the blessed Virgin. Another engraving shows us the saint in the act of receiving the stigmata, or the five wounds of Christ. There is suspended in the air a crucifix, and from the wounds of the image are drawn five lines, each of which impresses a corresponding wound, one on the side, and the other four on the hands and feet respectively of the saint. The foot-note is as follows: *Biennio ante mortem insignitur a Christo stigmatibus sacris.* He is next exhibited in the act of dying, his

soul having been raised to heaven in the form of a star. His dead body is next represented working miraculous cures, and the foot-note informs us, *Innumeris uti in vitâ, sic post obitum miraculis claret, triginta etiam mortuis resuscitatis.* In the next picture St. Francis is represented pouring blood from his side into a cup, to satisfy the incredulity of Pope Gregory IX., who is seen lying on a bed at the side of the saint, who is standing before a table filling the cup from his side, from which the blood is flowing most copiously. The foot-note tells us, *Gregorio Nono de vulnere lateris dubitanti phiala replere visus est sanguine de latere profluente.* From the next picture it would appear that his dead body stood miraculously erect, and whilst in that position was seen and worshipped by Pope Nicholas V., the foot-note being to the following effect: *Corpus ejus mortuum viventi simile per tot æva stans in pedes erectum sola divinâ vi sustentata vidit et veneratus est Nicolaus V. Pon. Max.* In another picture we see St. Francis pulling souls out of purgatory—the foot-note being, *Quotannis in purgatorium descendens suos ac ordini devotos inde liberat privilegio singulari.* This saint, I may say, seems to be a favourite of Dr. Newman's, for he often refers to him in his book, and says in one place, "St. Francis of Assisi, bareheaded and barefooted, would be hooted" by Protestants. I do not know that we should do that; but since Dr. Newman says that these are credible miracles, and that he has no difficulty in receiving them, I appeal to the intelligence and common sense of mankind,—and I know I have a response from its deepest depth,—whether these are not the delusions of Satan, the deceptions of fanatics, and not the miracles of the Omnipotent God.

I must now make a few observations upon the True Cross. Dr. Newman says: "I firmly believe that por-

tions of the True Cross are at Rome and elsewhere." The 'Tablet' of September 23, 1848, contains the following paragraph:—

"*St. George's Church.—Veneration of the Holy Cross.*—On Thursday last, the Feast of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross, the devout worshippers of St. George's were gratified, through the kindness of the Coadjutor Bishop of the District, by the opportunity of paying their veneration to a portion of the True Cross belonging to his Lordship, and by his favour exposed during the morning in front of the screen. A temporary altar was erected under the rood, at which mass was said at eleven. In front of it, raised on a beautiful throne, and surrounded by lights, the precious relic was from an early hour exposed to the veneration of the faithful, and after each of the masses it was given by the several priests to the people to kiss. It was delightful to see with what joy the opportunity was embraced by a crowd of worshippers. After the eleven o'clock mass the relic was borne in procession under a canopy round the church. Many hundred persons assisted at the solemn mass at eleven, and after the procession, kissed the relic presented by the Rev. Dr. Doyle. The worshippers were chiefly poor, including the children of the schools. To see Dr. Doyle, surrounded by his clergy, in that beautiful church, which, but for his persevering zeal, might never have been reared, offering the blessed wood of redemption to the homage of the lame, the blind, the ragged, and the little ones of the flock, with lights blazing all around, and the glorious sun shining through the painted windows, was a sight, the like to which has not been seen in London for many a long day." Upon which paragraph, the Rev. Mr. Lowell, in a letter to his Roman Catholic parishioners, and first published in the 'Coventry Standard,' made the following useful remarks:—"So early as in the

time of Paulinus, in the fifth century, portions of the True Cross had increased to such an extent, that it was necessary to account for their increase by a miracle. 'The cross,' says he, '*possessing a living power in its senseless material substance from the time of its discovery has continued daily to afford its wood to the almost innumerable cravings of men to possess some portion of it; and that in such a manner that it seems not to have sustained any loss; but, on the contrary, still to remain entire; while the worshippers, in taking to themselves a part, venerate it as a whole.*' (Epist. ii. to Severus.) If we believe that this miracle is still going on, then there is no wonder in Dr. Doyle's possessing a bit of the True Cross. The wonder rather is that any faithful Roman Catholic should be without a bit; for we are expressly told in the Paris Breviary, that *it is permitted that little splinters of this sacred wood may be had, to confer the grace of faith and other blessings.*" I would only suggest that it would be a great confirmation of our belief in the above miracle, supposing we were to put it to the test. No doubt Dr. Doyle's portion of the true Cross possesses the same multiplying power with every other portion. It would, therefore, be no great favour to ask him to cut off a little bit, to be kept at the Oratory in Birmingham, and it would be seen that the remainder would grow one day as big as it was before. "It is possible,"—and I quote from Mr. Powell's excellent letters—"however, that you may be rather sceptical respecting this miracle. In that case you will be the more anxious to ascertain whether the relic exhibited at St. George's be really a portion of the true Cross or no. If we turn to the Romish Prayer-book (or Breviary) and look to the service for the 3rd May, we shall there find the whole story about the first discovery of the cross on which Christ suffered. It is said to have been discovered by the

Empress Helen, in the year 326. It is there recorded that three crosses were found buried a great depth underground, and, apart from them all, was also found the title which had been affixed to the Cross of Christ. '*There was nothing which could make it appear to which of the three Crosses the title of the Lord's cross has been affixed; but a miracle removed all doubt. Macarius, the bishop of Jerusalem, after he had offered up prayers to God, applied each of these crosses to a woman who was afflicted with a severe sickness. The two first had no effect upon her; but as soon as the third was applied, it immediately cured her.*' The story in the *Paris* Breviary is hardly to be reconciled with this; but still it asserts that there were three Crosses found, and that the Cross of Christ was distinguished from the other two by its possessing a miraculous power. The discovery was made in the following manner:—'*A dead body was brought and laid on the spot. First, one of the crosses was applied to it, then another; but death spurned at the wood on which the criminals had suffered. Lastly, a resurrection evidenced which was the Lord's Cross, for no sooner did the wood of salvation touch the dead body, but immediately death took its flight,—the work of death disappeared,—the body which had been dead arose and, to the terror of those who beheld it, the dead man stood upon his feet, and then, in the presence of all the spectators, being perfectly restored to life (like Lazarus of old, when liberated from his grave-clothes), he walked before them all. Thus was the Cross discovered, and proved to be the very Cross of Christ by such an evidence as well became the occasion—by the evidence of a resurrection.*'" Now, whichever of these two stories you believe, it is evident that, according to the doctrine of the Roman Church, a miraculous power is inherent in the genuine wood of the true Cross. There is, therefore, no difficulty in ascertaining whether the bit of wood

exposed by Dr. Doyle at St. George's is a genuine portion of the true Cross, or a counterfeit. If it be genuine, it possesses the power of working miracles; if it be only a counterfeit, of course it has no more power than any other piece of wood. "Had Dr. Doyle's precious relic," continues Mr. Powell, "possessed the healing power which the Roman Church asserts to be the distinguishing characteristic of the genuine wood of the true Cross, he would not have allowed the imposing ceremony of Thursday last to have been deficient in that which would have been its most prevailing attraction. The blind and the lame, who so devoutly paid their homage as they supposed to the blessed wood of redemption, would not have returned from their devotions as blind and lame as when they set out. Try the genuineness of Dr. Doyle's boasted relic by the very test which the Church of Rome proposes as the sure proof of its genuineness; and if by this means you are convinced that it is all a *cheat* and an *imposture*, do be prevailed upon to seek some better guide in the way of salvation. That which has been described is not merely an attempt to play upon your credulity, in a manner of highest concernment, but it is more than this,—it is a device for leading you into the grievous sin of idolatry, by means of a very gross and wicked fraud." I saw in Belgium a portion of the true Cross. A Protestant writer, who has looked fully into the subject, says, that as much wood of the true Cross might be collected throughout Romish Christendom as would build a ship of war. But this would only make the miracle more remarkable, and, to a prepared appetite, the more credible.

There are also miraculous accounts respecting a medal, the origin of which is thus told in a work published in Paris in 1842, called, 'An Historical Account of the Origin and Effects of the new Medal

struck in honour of the Immaculate Conception of the most holy Virgin, and generally known by the name of the Miraculous Medal, by M——, Prêtre de la Congrégation D.L.M. de Saint-Lazare,' approved by the late Archbishop of Paris, and Gregory XVI.; at p. 26: "In the course of the month of September, in the year 1830, a young novice of the Daughters of Charity saw, during prayer, a tableau representing the holy Virgin, as she is commonly painted under the title of the Immaculate, standing, clothed in a white robe and a blue mantle, with her arms opened and stretched towards the earth. Her hands were covered with diamonds, from which proceeded rays of resplendent light towards the globe, and in great abundance upon a certain point. She heard at the same time a voice saying to her, 'These rays are the symbol of the graces which Mary obtains for men; and the point of the globe upon which she sheds them most abundantly is France.' Around this tableau she read the following invocation:—'O, Mary! conceived without sin, pray for us, who have recourse to you.' In a few moments the tableau turned round; and upon the reverse, she saw the letter M surmounted by a little cross, and beneath, the holy hearts of Jesus and of Mary. After considering this attentively, the novice heard again the same voice say, 'A medal must be struck after this model, and they who shall carry it, and utter with piety that short prayer, shall enjoy the special protection of the mother of God.'" Now, I have one of these blessed medals in my pocket, which I now show, but, except that it has worn a little hole in the lining, it has worked no miracle. This volume contains the account of about three hundred miracles, which have been worked by this medal. I will give you one or two as specimens. At p. 110, we are told, that an anchor of a vessel once became so fixed, that the

crew could not, although trying for three hours, move it. Upon this, the apostolical missionary of the congregation of Saint-Lazare, who happened to be on board, bethought himself of a miraculous medal which he had in his possession, and threw it into the sea, and immediately the anchor became loose. Another I give you is the miraculous conversion of a Turk, recorded at p. 258. "One day when M. Calvi was taking a walk with his children, they met a Turk, and conversed on religious matters on their way. Through the medium of one of his children, who understood French and spoke Arabic fluently, M. Calvi asked the Turk why he did not embrace Christianity. He answered, that his parents being Turks, he was of their religion. In the course of conversation our brother offered him a medal, which he willingly accepted, and left them; but two days after, the good Turk returned, saying, that he wished to be baptized, and that from the moment he received the medal he had felt that he could not be saved in his religion, and that the Catholic religion was alone true. His wife, to whom he spoke of the medal, but who had shown herself indifferent to it, at length asked for one, which she carried, and she too came and wished also to be baptized." All these wonderful conversions and results, you see, proceeded from the efficacy of this miraculous medal. In a paragraph in 'L'Univers,' we have another miracle ascribed to it. It is headed, "Miraculous escape.—M de B——, who was in the second train at the time the late accident on the Versailles railway occurred, states that he cannot account for his wonderful escape. All he knows is, that, on recovering his senses, he found himself in a vineyard some distance from the road. On his arrival at his own house he immediately prostrated himself before a crucifix. After a minute or two his mother, overpowered with joy on finding him

safe and sound, raised him up, when he exclaimed with fervour, 'Oh, mother, it is only through a miracle that I now behold you again!' saying this, he raised to his lips the miraculous medal, which had been placed near his heart." Are these miracles as the miracles of the New Testament? Are they not instinctively felt to be delusions or deceptions, the offspring of fanaticism, ignorance, and folly?

After this narrative of authentic miracles, I will quote Mr. Butler's extraordinary statement as to the obligation of believing them, contained in his 'Book of the Roman Catholic Church, &c.,' published in 1825 (p. 46.) "But . . . while the Roman Catholics assert that it has pleased Almighty God to work in every age, from the first preaching of the Gospel to the present time, many and incontestable miracles in favour of His Church and her doctrines [such, I presume, as those authentic ones I have narrated,] they admit, without qualification, that no miracles, except those which are related in the Old or in the New Testament, are articles of faith [*i.e.*, of vital importance,] that a person may disbelieve every other miracle, [if a miracle, it is a fact, and necessarily believed,] and may even disbelieve the existence of the persons through whose intercession they are related to have been wrought, without ceasing to be a Roman Catholic. This is equally agreeable to religion and common sense, [how delightful to find a Romanist recognising common sense!] for all the miracles which are not recorded in Holy Writ depend on human reasoning. Now, human reasoning being always fallible, all miracles depending on it rest on fallible proof, and, consequently, may be untrue. Hence, the divines of the Roman Catholic Church never impose the belief of particular miracles either upon the body of the faithful or upon individuals; they only recommend the belief of them [recommend

belief of frauds, follies, lying legends]. They never recommend the belief of any the credibility of which does not appear to them to be supported by evidence of the highest nature; [if true, we believe on evidence, not recommendation;] and, while they contend that the evidence is of this description, and cannot, therefore, be rationally disbelieved [see the specimens I have given], they admit that it is still no more than human [is it not ecclesiastical and papal?] testimony, and, therefore, liable to error. Dr. Milner [End of Controversy, Letter xxiv.] rejects, in the wholesale, the miracles related in 'The Golden Legend' of Jacobus de Voragine, those related in the 'Speculum' of Vincentius Belluacensis, and those related in the 'Saints' Lives' of the patrician Metapluas, &c. No Roman Catholic gives credit to those which rest on Suvius, or Moubritius. Dr. Lingard calls Osbert, the biographer of St. Dunstan, and the writer of his life, 'an injudicious biographer, whose dull credulity collected and embellished every fable. Dr. Lingard, also, while he asserts that there are many miracles in the Anglo-Saxon times which it would require no small ingenuity to disprove, and incredulity to discredit, admits that there are also many which must shrink from the frown of criticism, some which may have been the effect of accident or imagination, some that are more calculated to excite the smile than the wonder of the hearers, and some which, on whatever ground they were originally admitted, depend, at present, on the testimony of writers not remarkable for sagacity or discrimination. 'It was their misfortune,' says the same excellent writer, 'that the knowledge of these writers of miracles was not equal to their piety. Of their censors it may sometimes be said, that their piety was not equal to their knowledge.' This exposition of the Roman Ca-

tholic doctrine respecting miracles has been often given."

One saint seems to have been an Ætna, a Vesuvius, or a burning mountain. Such were those who required to have water constantly supplied to them, in order to cool their divine love by hydropathic baths. What combustible personages they must have been! How dangerous must Oratorians be to contiguous houses if these fathers are as combustible as their predecessors! Is the Oratory in Birmingham insured? what is the premium? If it be not, it may one day ignite or explode, and ruin be the consequence; but if it be, no doubt it must have paid a very high premium. If we only had a column of such saints, coals would not be required. St. Philip Neri alone would warm all the monks of all the Oratories in England. And as to perfume, why, some of the saints were perfect roses. One saint perfumed all Boulogne; half a dozen would perfume London. Then the Commissioners of Sewers would be superseded. St. Philip Neri, Dr. Newman's founder, was a wonderful genius besides. He could smell out holiness and sin. Now we have heard that the camel has a keen scent of water, and that the foxhound and the bloodhound have an acute smell; but the nose of St. Philip Neri was vastly more susceptible than the snouts of these: he could discern moral qualities by the smell; the pure by their sweet odour, and the impure by their bad odour. All this is stated in the Bull of Canonization, and also in the Breviary. The Apostles discerned spirits, but St. Philip's succession is far superior to Apostolical succession: he smelt virtues and vices, right and wrong. What a quick business would it be, were we to let loose an Oratorian father among our parishes and flocks: he could separate the bad fishes from the good at a

whiff. What a useful thing would an Oratorian be at a parliamentary election! Why, St. Philip Neri, or anyone with St. Philip's virtues, could smell out a Whig or a Tory. What a capital detective police officer would an Oratorian make! In St. Francis, again, we have a preacher who preferred beasts and birds and fishes for his congregation. He was the great menagerie-preacher of Christendom. What a treat would he be in the Zoological gardens! On one occasion the boa-constrictor in London swallowed his blanket, and the keeper had terrible work to get him to disgorge it; but if he had applied for one of the best Franciscan monks, the reptile would have made him a cheerful present of this blanket at one bidding. How composedly would the owl listen to a Franciscan monk—the bird of night feeling perfectly at home beside a missionary of the night! Some of the saints were small volcanoes, whose only chance of existence was being near plenty of cold water. Others of the saints were positively wags and wits. They were incessantly playing tricks with the devil. One pulls his nose, another spits in his face, another whips a lady, and all of them do the most unsaintly things. We are told to resist the devil; but then, our weapons are not carnal: but these Romish saints resisted him by striking and kicking him, and spitting in his face, and exhibiting regular pugilistic encounters.

But there is one miracle which is classified with Scripture miracles, and received as heartily as the doctrine that Jesus Christ is the Saviour of sinners, the miracle of transubstantiation, the great standing miracle of the Church of Rome. Roman Catholics complain that we Protestants will not go into proof. We have gone into proof, and are ready to go into proof again: we complain that they will not submit the proofs. The miracle of transubstantiation they say

is a miracle and an article of faith: I allege it is a delusion. I met once an eloquent and acute defender of the Romish church, who discussed that topic with me; and when I had shown that eloquent and gifted defender of the Church of Rome that the Fathers contradicted each other in the dogmas that they believed, I wanted him to leave the Fathers, and to come with me to the grandfathers—the Apostles and the Evangelists of the New Testament Scriptures. He said, that as Dr. Cumming seemed to have a patrophobia, he would come to that book called the Bible, and he then turned to me and said, "Now,"—as he read these words, "This is my body,"—"Dr. Cumming, none of your figures of speech, none of your orientalisms, none of your explaining texts away. I have gone to your own book; here is the text that proves transubstantiation, 'This is my body.'"

I turned round to him, and said in reply, "I also go to the Bible and read 'All flesh is grass.' Mr. French, none of your figures of speech, none of your orientalisms, none of your explaining away: you have brought me to the Scriptures; I follow you step by step; and now, sir, I assert that you are not the distinguished barrister and professor I thought you were, but that if I were to tickle you, like Shakspeare's Jew, you would not laugh—if I were to prick you, you would not wince,—you are a bundle of grass, and I assert that you are so by the very interpretation that you take up to support transubstantiation, for 'All flesh is grass.'" I said to him, in the next place, "But show me the passage on which you build so much—where is it?" I argued:—"It cannot be a miracle, because the senses do not perceive it. If I take the wafer after the priest has consecrated it, it tastes like a wafer, and feels like a wafer; and all the senses, at least four of them, testify that it is a wafer,

or flour and water." To which he said, "Oh, but the senses are deceived." To which I answered, "In that case, it may be something else, but a miracle it cannot be; for a miracle is something in which the senses are not deceived. In the meantime, will you point out to me the text on which you found the doctrine?" He turned to the passage, and said, "This is my body." I took the book from his hand, and said, "I read it, 'These are the bricks with which Babylon is built.'" He asked what I meant. I replied, "You say, every Sunday your senses are deceived. Your senses may be deceived while you read, 'This is my body;' my senses may inform me rightly when I am reading, 'These are the bricks with which Babylon is built.' If the senses are deceived, one man may see what another man cannot; and if the senses be deceived, who is to judge what are the words before us: I may be right, and you may be wrong; for there is no way of determining which is right, except by a criterion which you say may be deceived, and that upon your own showing."

Another mode by which I endeavoured to demonstrate the difficulty of his position, was that of showing him that, on his supposition, we must believe that Jesus held His own body in His hand, and while He sat visibly before the twelve, they held each His whole body in his hand. And how is it possible, too, I would ask, if our blessed Lord's body was in all respects like ours, sin excepted, that a Roman Catholic can believe that on each of a hundred thousand altars, if there be so many, at one moment, there is the whole body of Christ present? And if the priest believes as he does that next Sunday, should he break the consecrated host into twenty pieces, in each of those twenty pieces will be the whole body of Christ, I ask him how can this be? He answers, "It is a miracle." It is, I reply, wanting in the very

essence of a miracle. It is a monstrosity, not a miracle, and it is in the face of Scripture, which says, that His body, sin excepted, was in all points like ours. According to transubstantiation, a body may be in several places at one and the same moment. Thus, when the Resurrection comes, Henry, Thomas, Peter, or William, may have his body in two different places whole and entire, perfect and complete. And if William on rising, should be coming from one place, and meet William having risen, and coming from another, how startled would he be; but how easily could he plead the miracle of transubstantiation, to show that a body could be in two or twenty places at once.

Protestants and Romanists agree that the miracles wrought by our Lord and his Apostles abundantly prove that they were teachers sent from God. The mission and character of Christ and the Apostles being thus irrefragably established, and historically and demonstrably evidenced to us, as if done before us, by testimony, it seems unnecessary to interpose again for the same end, and for the same object. The original signature is not effaced; the Divine seal is not destroyed. The less the necessity, and the greater the pretence to miraculous powers, the more reason we have for suspicion; and our reasons for suspicion are increased by the fact, that some of the miracle-workers of the Church of Rome are detected impostors, some have been proved to be fanatics, and lastly, most learned and respectable authorities and divines in the Romish communion admit that many of the miracles accredited by the Church of Rome were simply got up to increase the piety of the faithful. In the next place, those miracles which we have quoted, alleged to have been done by saints now canonized, and not a few by the great St. Philip Neri, are, some so ludicrously

grotesque, some so palpably absurd, others so meaningless, pointless, and objectless, and others so anile, that not to laugh at, or deplore, and certainly scout them as the proofs of lunacy, or fanaticism, or wild delusion, is to do injustice and discredit to the sublime and solemn miracles of Christianity. There is such a similarity, almost identity, between heathen and Romish miracles,—both about equally authenticated,—that one cannot help thinking that Satan is doing for the Popedom what he did for heathendom, and no more. Pythagoras tamed the Daunian bear; St. Francis a wolf. Pythagoras whispered intelligibly into a bull's ear; and St. Francis preached to oxen. Pythagoras's golden thigh has its match at Saragossa. Do images wink, speak, perspire? So the image of Juno spoke to a soldier at Veii. The Roman emperors, according to Tacitus and Suetonius, did miracles as good as those recorded of the saints of the Church of Rome. Miracles as good, and scarcely so monstrous, are attributed to the Arians in the fourth century, the Novatians, and the Eutychians. Chrysostom, in one passage at least, in defending the true Church, says that she pretends to no miracles, and asserts that miracles had ceased; and, taking this passage as a fair exponent of his views, although others may be quoted which seem to show the reverse, Chrysostom occupied precisely the same position against the Arians and the Donatists that the Archbishop of Canterbury does against the Romanists. Dr. Newman and his saints in this matter look like the successors of such heretics as the Arians and the Donatists, whilst our Protestant ministers look like the successors of Chrysostom and Augustine, who in the passages I refer to did not pretend that the Church had miraculous powers.

Those are not miracles proceeding from God that authenticate a false doctrine. Jesus has authenti-

cated the Holy Scriptures as God's will and word. Whatever contradicts the Bible cannot be from God, or come with credentials by God. "If we, or an angel from heaven," which assumes a miraculous manifestation, "were to preach to you any other doctrine, let him be anathema." Let us never forget, too, that we are warned to expect men doing wonders, such as could deceive, if possible, the very elect. Let us remember, too, that "lying signs and wonders," not so much false ones as τέρασι ψεύδους, "signs or wonders authenticating a lie," are part of the features of the Church of Rome, as given by the Apostle in his portrait of the "man of sin." In the next place, the historians of the Scripture miracles are infallible —confessedly, admittedly so—and Dr. Newman subscribes to this. The historians of Romish miracles are fallible. This all must admit; and the statement by Mr. Butler, a very distinguished defender of the Church of Rome, which I have already quoted, shows that this is the doctrine of that Church. We do well to hesitate to accept Romish miracles.

The translation of the holy house of Loretto is a fair specimen of the evidence of most miracles. I have gone into the evidence of it; and the evidence is most triumphantly against its being anything else than a *delusion* or *deception*. Here is an account which is stated in the tablet on the Chapel of Loretto, as translated by Stillingfleet:—"The Church of our blessed Lady of Loretto was a chamber of the house of the Blessed Virgin Mary, mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, which house stood in the country of Judea, in a city of Galilee, whose name was Nazareth; in which chamber the Blessed Virgin Mary was born, and bred up, and afterwards there received the salutation of the Angel Gabriel, and in the same chamber she educated her Son Jesus Christ to the age of twelve years. After the ascen-

sion of Christ to heaven, the Virgin Mary remained upon earth with the Apostles and other disciples of Christ, who, seeing many Divine mysteries performed in the said chamber, did, by the common consent of them all, decree to make a church of that chamber, to the honour and memory of the Blessed Virgin Mary, which they did, and the Apostles and disciples consecrated that chamber to be a church, and there celebrated Divine offices, and St. Luke the Evangelist, with his own hands, made an image to the likeness of the Blessed Virgin, which is there to this day. Afterwards that church was inhabited and honoured with much devotion by the Christian people in those parts in which it stood, as long as the people remained Christian. But after they renounced the Christian faith and embraced Mahometanism, the angels of God took away the said church, and carried it into the parts of Sclavonia, and there placed it by a certain castle called Fiume, where it met not with that honour which the Blessed Virgin desired. Therefore the angels came and took it from thence, and carried it clear over the sea into the parts of the territory of Recanati, and there placed it in a wood which belonged to a noble lady who had the command of the city of Recanati, and was owner of the wood, whose name was Loreta, and from her the church took its name of S. Maria de Loreto. In that time, by reason of the great concourse of all people to that wood in which the church remained, abundance of robberies and mischiefs were committed there; and therefore the angels again took up the chapel and carried it to a hill belonging to two brothers, where the angels set it down. Those brothers getting a vast revenue by the resort of pilgrims thither, and the oblations by them made, fell to a great discord. Upon which, the angels came again and took away the chapel from that place, and carried it into the

highway; and there placed it where it is now, with many signs and innumerable gifts and miracles. Then all the people of Recanati went to see the church which stood upon the earth without any foundation: and, being astonished at such a miracle, and fearing lest it should come to ruin, they compassed it about with a good thick wall and a strong foundation, as it is seen at this day; and yet no one knew from whence that church came into those parts, until, in A.D. 1290, the Blessed Virgin appeared in a dream to a certain man much devoted to her, to whom she revealed the foregoing things, and he presently divulged them to certain honest men of that country; who immediately resolved to know the truth of these matters, and therefore determined to send sixteen notable good men to Nazareth to find out the truth of them. These carried with them the size of the said church, and there they found exactly the foundations of it and the just measure; and, to make all sure, they found it written upon a wall that such a church had been there and was gone from thence; and those persons upon their return certified the truth of all these things; and from that time it was known that that chapel was the chamber of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and the Christian people showed great devotion towards it: for the Blessed Virgin there every day doth infinite miracles, as experience shows. There was a certain eremite that was called Brother Paul of the Wood, who dwelt in a small cottage in that wood, and every morning went to Divine offices in that chapel, and was a man of a great abstinence and a holy life, who said, that ten years before, or thereabouts, on the day of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, being the 8th of September, two hours before day, in a clear air going out of his cottage towards the church, he saw a light descend from heaven upon the church, twelve feet

long and six broad, and when it was upon the church it vanished: upon which he said it was the Blessed Virgin, which there appeared on the day of her nativity, and came to see her feast observed; but no man saw her beside this holy man. To confirm the truth and certainty of all these things, two honest men of this village reported them several times to me, Teremanus, the overseer and governor of the said church: one of them was called Paulus Renaldatii, the other, Francis Prior. The said Paul told me that his grandfather's grandfather saw when the angels carried the said chapel over the sea and placed it in the wood, and that he and other persons ofttimes went to the said chapel. And the said Francis oft-times said to me, that his grandfather being one hundred and twenty years old, said that he went often to the said church in the wood. Moreover, the said Francis averred that his grandfather's grandfather had a house and dwelt there; and that in his time the chapel was removed by angels from the Hill of the Two Brothers to the highway." Now, Baronius (Annal. tom. i. c. 9, n. 1.) accepts this miracle and refers to Canisius, *Hist. Deiparæ*, lib. v. c. 25, for a fuller account of it, and both rest it on the omnipotence of God. Our faith, however, is not what God can do, but what He has said and done, and is recorded to have done. Raynaldus (A.D. 1291, n. 68, 69), Bzovius (*Annal. ad.* A.D. 1296, n. 14), Spondanus (A.D. 1291, n. 22), and Benedictus Gononus (*Chronic. Deip.* A.D. 1298), all refer to Horatius Tersellinus (*Hist. Lauret.* lib. i. c. 6) as the most authentic historian of the miracle. His story is the same as that of the tablet, only that he states some additional wonders, as that the trees bowed to it as it passed, and that the image of the Saviour, being taken out to be placed in a more conspicuous niche, returned to the chapel of its own accord. No witnesses are produced

to attest to having personally seen a chapel sailing through the air, or having seen it pitched upon the ground. Then what is the evidence upon which Rome relies? Why just this: two plain countrymen give testimony, not that they saw it moving through the air, but one that his grandfather saw it, and the other that his great-great-grandfather saw it. Tursellinus says that they swore to it; but still it is upon the strength of these two testimonies that this miracle of the translation of the ancient habitation of the Blessed Virgin is believed. Now, supposing that we take it that the great-great-grandfather, not upon his own testimony, but upon that of his great-great-grandson, did see something in the air while he was cutting wood, let us ask, Was this great-great-grandfather sure that this something was the chapel of Loretto? Did he see angels carrying it? or are angels visible? How did he know they were angels, not having seen such before? Was he quite sure that what he saw was not a ship with all its sails set, on the Adriatic? Did such a phenomenon excite so little attention, that only two men are found, who testify, not that they saw it, but the one that his grandfather, and the other that his great-great-grandfather saw it a hundred years ago? And besides this, St. Vincentius Ferrerius, who lived after A.D. 1440, says (*Serm. de Assump. B. V.*), that the chamber of our Lady was still in Nazareth. St. Antonin of Florence, who lived some time after this alleged miraculous translation, writing on miracles, is silent about it. Blondus, in 1450, says (*Italia illustr. in Piceno*, p. 339) there was a chapel of our Lady at Loretto, but nothing of the miraculous translation. And how remarkable, too, that this house should have escaped being destroyed, when the ploughshares of Titus and Vespasian tore up all the foundations of ancient Jerusalem. It may be asked also, How was

it that this house did not suffer decay during 1300 years? And how could it be removed to Italy, and yet, as the Greeks testify, be still at Nazareth? Tursellinus (*Hist. Lauret.* lib. ii. c. 18) gives a miracle in proof of this prior miracle, which would certainly be, in some minds, a very conclusive evidence:—"A priest of Dalmatia, being devoted to the blessed Virgin of Loretto, was taken prisoner by the Turks, who would have forced him to renounce his religion, which he would not do, but still called upon Christ and Mary; they being enraged, asked what he meant by using those names so often; he told them that these clave to his very heart; on which they threatened they would pull out his heart and lungs if he did not curse Jesus and Mary. On their resolving to do so, the poor priest made a vow to the blessed Virgin of Loretto, that if he lived he would go there on a pilgrimage. They then cut open his breast, and pulled out his heart and lungs, and gave them into his hand, and bade him go to the Lady of Loretto. The priest set out, carrying his heart and lungs in his hand, and arrived safe at Loretto, and to our Lady's servants there he showed his breast and his entrails taken out." Now, if one asks, How can one breathe without lungs? the answer is, It is a miracle. If you ask, How can the blood circulate without the heart? the answer again is, It is a miracle. If you ask questions about the miraculous translations of the house of Loretto, the answer still is, A miracle! a miracle! In short, the Church of Rome draws on the omnipotence of God for sanctions to the impostures of her priesthood. There is no evidence of any of these miracles it is worthy of sanity to receive. We go into proof of these miracles, and we find the proofs are no proofs, the witnesses mere traditionists, and the facts attested the fantastic tricks of jugglers. The result of the whole matter is, that they are not

miracles, but the tricks of impostors, or the delusions of fanatics.

The Scripture miracles must be true. They are beyond doubt or dispute among Protestants or Romanists. The Bible is closed; its testimony is clear; I am sure that if God has wrought a miracle to authenticate a truth there, he never will work a miracle to authenticate a lie that directly contradicts it. Therefore, miracles worked in defence of Romanism, if wrought by God, would be Omnipotence attesting that which would be opposite to what Omnipotence attested before—it would be literally God contradicting Himself—it would be, in short, the reversal of that beautiful and precious announcement, "God cannot lie." I am satisfied, therefore, not only on this ground, but from the evidence,—satisfied from the very perusal of the miracles ascribed to the saints of Rome, that they are delusions; and, therefore, I repudiate them all. We honour the Scriptures, we honour God, we vindicate Christianity from the assaults of infidels, when we deplore some of these pretended miracles as the offspring of ignorance and delusion, and denounce others as frauds and wicked impostures. What is untrue must perish. Babylon grows in credulity and imposture. Her fall is near.

VII.

MARIOLATRY.

THIS is a grave charge. Is it justified by evidence? If it be, we must not shrink from making it.

In the Creed of Pope Pius IV. it is stated, "I believe likewise, that the saints, reigning together with Christ, are to be honoured and invocated,—"*honorandos et invocandos.*" And in the decree of the Council of Trent on the invocation and veneration of saints it is decreed: "The holy synod commands the bishops and others who have the office and care of instruction, that, according to the custom of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, which has been received from the first ages of the Christian religion, the consent of the holy fathers and the decrees of the sacred councils, they make it a chief point diligently to instruct the faithful concerning the intercession and the invocation of saints, the honour of relics, and the lawful use of images; teaching them that the saints, reigning together with Christ, offer to God their prayers for men, and that it is good and useful to invoke them with supplications, and on account of the benefits obtained from God through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord (who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour), to have recourse to the prayers, aid, and assistance of the saints; but that they who deny

that the saints, enjoying eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked, or who assert, either that they do not pray for men, or that the invoking them that they may pray for each of us, is idolatry, or that it is contrary to the honour of God, and opposed to the honour of the one Mediator between God and man, or that it is folly either in word or thought to supplicate them, are to be accursed."

The distinctions drawn by the Church of Rome are these: she calls the supreme worship that is to be given to God λατρεια (*latria*)—a Greek word signifying *worship:* the worship to be given to the Virgin Mary is υπερδουλεια (*hyper-doulia*)—a lofty form of worship, but not so high as that given to God; and the worship given to the saints in general, is δουλεια, (*doulia*)—an inferior but still religious worship.

The Roman Catholics, however, will deny that they worship the Virgin Mary with the worship due to God; and we concede, that in the canons of the Council of Trent, and in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., the distinction is clearly and definitely kept up. But what we allege is, that the books of a Church that professes to be infallible, and under the express sanction or silence of Popes and Councils, a worship is given to the saints and to the Virgin Mary, which can be characterised by no softer epithet than that of idolatry.

The first document we shall produce is one with which most Roman Catholics are familiar; it is called 'The Glories of Mary.' The author, Alphonso Liguori, was canonized and beatified so lately as the year 1839, by the late Pope Gregory XVI. Four Popes, it is stated in the title-page, have expressed their approbation of the life and writings of this saint; and we are informed, in the Preface, that the Council at Rome, the sacred Congregation of Rites, having made the most rigorous examination of the

writings of the saint, to the number of a hundred or more, pronounced that there was nothing in them deserving of censure; and this sentence, we find, was approved by Pope Pius VII. in 1803, by his successor, Leo XII., and also by Pope Urban VIII., and in 1839 St. Liguori was canonized by Pope Gregory XVI. It is thus asserted in the Preface that it contains nothing but what is consistent with the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and that it may be used by the faithful for the edification and instruction of their souls. Now, in order to give some idea of the worship rendered to the Virgin Mary, and thus sanctioned, we give the following extracts from this volume:—

Page 35. "Queen of heaven—and of earth! Mother of God! my sovereign mistress! I present myself before you, as a poor mendicant before a mighty queen. From the height of your throne deign to cast your eyes upon a miserable sinner, and lose not sight of him till you render him truly holy. O illustrious Virgin! you are the queen of the universe, and consequently mine. I desire to consecrate myself more particularly to thy service; dispose of me according to your good pleasure. Direct me; I abandon myself wholly to your conduct. Chastise me if I disobey you. I am then no longer mine; I am all yours. Save me, O powerful queen, save me;"—it is added, we admit, "by the intercession of your Son."

Page 88. "God commanded Moses to make the propitiatory of the most pure gold, because it was from thence He wished to speak to him. A learned writer states, that Mary is the propitiatory of the Christian people, whence our Lord gives them answers of pardon and forgiveness, and dispenses to them his gifts and his graces."

Page 136. "Blessed Virgin, who in your double

quality of queen and mother dispense your favours with such munificence and love! I, who am so poor in merit and virtue, and greatly indebted to the Divine justice, humbly recommend myself to you. You, O Mary, have the keys of the Divine mercy; draw on thine inexhaustible treasure, and dispense its riches to this poor sinner, in proportion to his immense wants. All who trust in Mary, will see Heaven's gates open to receive them. She is the gate of Heaven, since the Church styles her Janua Cœli. The Holy Church styles her also the Star of the Sea."

In page 177 we read that "Brother Leo once saw in a vision two ladders reaching to heaven; one red, at the summit of which was Jesus Christ; and the other white, at the top of which presided His blessed mother. He observed that many who endeavoured to ascend to Heaven by the red ladder, at the top of which was Christ, after mounting a few steps, fell down, and on trying again were equally unsuccessful; but a voice having told them to make trial of the white ladder, at the top of which was His mother, they immediately got up to Heaven, the blessed Virgin having held out her hands to receive them." And thus it is taught to Roman Catholics—to five millions in Ireland, and to two millions in England—that, if the poor and guilty sinners of mankind attempt to get to Heaven by that blessed Redeemer, who is "the way and the truth and the life," they will be rejected; but that if they make the effort to ascend by the Virgin Mary from the depths of ruin to the heights of glory, they will find more mercy in her than in the bosom of Him who "loved us, and gave himself for us."

The next document is called 'Salvation made easy to Sinners by Devotion to the most Sacred Heart of Mary,' dated 1840. At page 32 we read: "God has

decreed in His infinite wisdom to grant us everything by Mary, by whom He has given to us Jesus. Oh! who could ever appreciate that treasure as much as Mary? Who loves us more tenderly? The charity of Mary for us had reached its most sublime degree, since she loved us so far as to give us her own dearest treasure, even to consent to the bloody immolation of Jesus."

The next is called 'A Portrait of the admirable Joseph, dated Dublin, 1838, and stated on the title-page to be composed by a Catholic priest. At page 35 we read: "O most desirable Jesus! O most amiable Mary! O most dear Joseph! O Holy Trinity!"—calling these three "Holy Trinity." Again: "O Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, who can express the sanctity of your lives, and of your conversation!" Page 36: "O Jesus, Mary, and Joseph, most blessed Trinity, bless me with the triple benediction of the most holy Lord." And this expression "Trinity" is frequently applied to Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.

The next document is 'The Sacred Heart,' a very popular book of devotions among Roman Catholics. In it the following passage occurs at page 171: "Come, poor and hardened sinners, how great soever your crimes may be, come and behold, Mary stretches out her hand, opens her breast to receive you. Though insensible to the great concerns of your salvation, though unfortunately proof against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the Holy Ghost, fling yourselves at the feet of Mary, this powerful advocate. Her heart is all love, all tenderness." The amount of this is, that those whom the Holy Spirit fails to convince and convert, the Virgin Mary has strength and power to convince and convert.

The next extract is taken from the Encyclical

Letter of the late Pope Gregory XVI., addressed by him in 1832 to all the bishops and priests of the Roman Catholic Church, scattered throughout the whole of Great Britain and Ireland. After alluding to the various difficulties with which the Church was surrounded, he closes the letter by saying: "And that all may have a successful and happy issue, let us raise our eyes to the most blessed Virgin Mary, who alone destroys heresies, who is our greatest hope, yea, the entire ground of our hope."

This we have taken from the 'Laity's Directory' for the year 1832; and this language of the late Pope was then read from every Roman Catholic altar throughout the kingdom.

But perhaps the most extraordinary specimen of Roman Catholic idolatry which has ever been presented to the public is called 'The Psalter of the blessed Bonaventure.' St. Bonaventure is a distinguished saint in the Roman Catholic Calendar, and on Bonaventure's day (July 14) every Roman Catholic in England prays in the following words: "O Lord, who didst give blessed Bonaventure to thy people for a minister of eternal salvation, grant that he who was the instructor of our life here on earth, may become our intercessor in heaven." Every Roman Catholic, therefore, must feel obliged to anyone who brings before him the doctrines which Bonaventure taught.

The psalms and hymns here translated were composed by St. Bonaventure. The Psalter will be found in the Vatican edition of his works. It is largely quoted in the 'Glories of Mary,' by St. Liguori, and in the Redemptorist edition published under the approval of Dr. Wiseman. It is referred to and quoted at least a hundred times in the footnotes. I have ten editions of it, under the title of

'Tributo Quotidiano,' from 1834 to 1844, published at Rome with the express approbation of the late Pope, Gregory XVI., and one copy of the same work, in Italian, dated 1851, during the present Pontificate, with the official Imprimatur. In this 'Tributo,' however, the *Litany* is wanting. The *Te Deum* is found in it. I have several editions published at Lyons, Rouen, and Paris, with the following titlepage: 'Psautier de la Sainte Vierge, composé par Saint Bonaventure, traduit en Francais par le R. P. J. Gallifet. Lyon J. B. Pelagaud et Cie. Imp. Lib. de N. S. P. Pape, Grande Rue, Merciere 26, 1850.' Another edition is entitled, 'Les Deux Psautiers de la Bienheureuse Vierge Marie, par S. Bonaventure. Traduction nouvelle par Henri de Riancey, Paris, Libraire, Rue St. Sulpice, 23, 1852.' I have others so recent as 1860 and 1864.

The Church of Rome is therefore committed to this work. Roman Catholics must accept it. It is nowhere abjured, repented of, or renounced. New editions, at one franc and a half each, appear in succession in France and Italy, and also in England, in the shape of extracts from it in Liguori's 'Glories of Mary.'

The following prefatory remarks occur in a late French edition: "Of all the little works composed by St. Bonaventure in honour of the glorious Mother of God, and which breathe a piety so profound, and a doctrine so elevated and sure, there is none more celebrated than that which has for its title the 'Psalter of the Blessed Virgin Mary.'

"It is a collection of a hundred and fifty Psalms suggested by the Psalms of David. Each Psalm begins by the same words as those of the royal Prophet; the general sense of them is preserved and applied to the Holy Virgin, with a rare aptitude of

expression, and an admirable poetry of thought and language. At the end of them are placed the Canticles, in imitation of those of the Prophets; a Hymn, which answers to the Te Deum, and a Creed like that of St. Athanasius. All the faithful servants of the blessed Virgin are acquainted with this book, and recite with pleasure these prayers, which breathe so sweet a charm and so touching a sublimity. But the most recent translation which they possess dates from the last century. And as it strikes us that the style is rather antiquated; that it would be a work agreeable to Christians' minds to offer them a more modern version, we have therefore tried to do so, keeping with the most scrupulous exactitude, as near as possible, to the original text. We have followed the order traced by the seraphic Doctor, and we have applied ourselves to reproduce as much as lay in our power the simple and majestic expressions of that great Saint. How much have we felt our personal inability! How much have we regretted the weakness of our language, in which there is so much difficulty, notwithstanding its richness, to express the beauties and precision of the Latin language. We have employed all our efforts; our ambition limits itself to hope that the Christian will give us credit for our intentions. Independent of the Psalter, properly so called, St. Bonaventure has composed a beautiful poem, to which he gives the name of the Little Psalter, 'Psalterium Minus.' This poem is composed of a hundred and fifty stanzas, of which the stanzas of four verses have some relation to the Psalms of David. These verses have an exquisite perfume of devotion and simplicity, and they are often exalted in accents of sublime enthusiasm. We have done the same to the Litanies of the blessed Virgin Mary that St. Bonaventure had annexed to this little work. This part of our work is entirely

new, and this is, we believe, the first time it has been presented in French to the faithful.

"One of the translators of the Psalter had intended to divide it into days and hours, in imitation of the offices of the Church; and many persons in the use of them follow this plan of recital. To agree with this laudable custom, we have placed at the end of the Psalter a table which reproduces the division of the Rev. Father Galiffett, and refers to the Psalms, to the Canticles, and to the Hymns. The Father Galiffett had added to them the prayers that are not by St. Bonaventure; we have placed in their stead the stanzas of the Little Psalter, arranged for this purpose.

"All that is included in the present book is taken from St. Bonaventure. The more one studies this great genius and those of his century, the more one is inspired with love and veneration towards their works, where reigns a faith so ardent, a theology so luminous, and a piety so sanguine and so sweet, we could propose for the Christians of our days nothing more worthy of them than to borrow the learned and authorised voice of the illustrious Doctor, so justly admired by our Fathers.

"We beseech them to be good enough to remember us in their prayers; and we love to believe that the blessed Virgin Mary, protectress of France, our patroness and our mother, will deign to cast a look of mercy upon this humble homage, a feeble echo of the work of one of the greatest saints who devoted himself to sing her praises.

"Passy, the Feast of the Compassion of the Holy Virgin."

St. Bonaventure introduces his work in these words: "Have recourse to her, and she will exalt you, and you shall be honoured by her, when you shall have embraced her. She will shed upon your

head abundance of grace, and encircle you with a brilliant crown. Therefore it is that I beseech you, beloved and cherished ones, refuse not the beautiful and noble Virgin; despise not this Queen, so admirable and so venerable, the Virgin Mary, lest if she see herself rejected by you, not only will you be deprived of her holy favours, but also, which God forbid, you would incur eternal misery. Obey her then; open the innermost recesses of your intelligence to prepare your heart; unloose your tongue to praise and glorify her; hasten to please her by your eager services; as it is certain her conversation will render you more pious, her approach more chaste and more pure, her embraces more ornamented by virtue and more loaded with grace."

PSALTER OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

Psalm i.

Blessed is the man that cherishes thy name, Virgin Mary, thy grace will strengthen his soul.

As a garden watered by springs of living water, thou wilt multiply in that soul the sweetest fruits of justice.

Thou art blessed among all women, because of the humble faith of thy holy heart.

For thou art exalted above all women by the beauty of thy person; thou surpassest the angels and the archangels by the excellence of thy sanctity.

Thy mercy and thy grace are celebrated everywhere: God has blessed the works of thy hands.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost, now and always, and from generation to generation. Amen.

Psalm ii.

Why do our enemies rage, and why have they imagined vain things against us?

May thy right hand protect us, Mother of God: terrible as an army in the battle, confound them and destroy them.

Come to her, ye who are in distress and in tribulation, and she will give rest unto your souls.

Have recourse to her in thy temptations, and the serenity of her countenance will strengthen thee.

Bless her with all thy heart, for the entire earth is full of her mercy.

Psalm vi.

O Lady, permit me not to be delivered over to the fury of God, that I be not judged in his anger.

For the honour of thy name, O Lady, let the fruit of thy glorious womb be propitious.

From the gates of hell and from the abyss, deliver us by thy holy prayers.

That the eternal gates may be opened to us, to the end that we may recount thy marvellous works to all eternity.

For it is not the dead, neither those who are in hell, that shall praise thee, O Lady, but those who by thy grace obtain eternal glory.

Psalm vii.

O Lady, I have hoped in thee; deliver my soul from mine enemies.

Shut the mouth of the lion and break his teeth, and close the lips of my persecutors.

Delay not, for the honour of thy name, to have mercy upon us.

Let the glory of thy countenance shine upon us, that our conscience may become pure before the Most High.

If the enemy persecute my soul, O Lady, that I may be strengthened by thy power, let not thy sword shine against us.

Glory, &c.

Psalm viii.

O Lady! it is by thee that the Lord became our brother and our Saviour.

As the fire in the bush was ardent, and as the dew upon the fleece, by thee is descended the Word of God.

The Holy Spirit has rendered thee fruitful, and the virtue of the Almighty has overshadowed thee.

Blessed be thy pure conception, blessed be thy virginal delivery!

Blessed be the purity of thy flesh; blessed be the sweet mercy of thy heart.

Glory, &c.

Psalm xxiv.

The earth is the Lord's, and all that is therein; and thou, Holy Mother, thou reignest with him in eternity.

Thou art clothed in glory and beauty; all precious stones form thy garment and thy vestments.

The splendour of the sun is upon thy head: the beauty of the moon is beneath thy feet.

The twinkling of the constellations ornament thy seat; the stars glorify thee, O Star of Morn.

Remember thou us, O Lady, in thy goodness, and render thou us worthy to glorify thy name.

Psalm xxxvii.

Enter not into judgment with the wicked, O Lady; soften their fury by thy grace.

Hope in her, nuns and monks; have confidence in her, clergy and laity.

Delight yourself in her praises, and she will favourably hear the desires of your heart.

Little riches with her favour, is better than treasures of silver and precious stones.

Glory be to thee, evermore, Queen of heaven, and grant thou mayest never forget us.

Psalm li.

Have pity upon me, O Lady, thou who art called the mother of mercy;

And by the depths of thy mercy, purify me from all mine iniquities.

Shed thy grace upon me, and refuse me not thy accustomed clemency.

Because I confess my sins unto thee, and accuse myself of my crimes before thee.

Reconcile me with the fruit of thy womb, and make my peace with him who made me.

Psalm xciv.

The Lord is the God of vengeance; but thou, the benign mother of mercy, thou wilt turn Him to pity.

Thy magnificence, O Lady, is celebrated throughout all ages; and they who honour thee will find the road to peace.

Serve her with respectful joy, and the fruit of her holy womb will heal you.

Look upon the humility of thy servants, O Lady, and they will praise thee in the generations of ages.

Glorify thy name by the enumeration of thy graces, and suffer not thy servants to sink in danger.

Glory, &c.

Psalm xcv.

Come, let us celebrate our Lady; let us sing the Virgin Queen, our salvation.

Let us come with gladness before her face; and praise her in our canticles.

Come, let us adore and prostrate ourselves before her: let us confess to her our sins with penitence.

Let us obtain full indulgence; assist us to the tribunal of God.

Receive our souls at the last day, and introduce us into eternal repose.

Glory, &c.

Psalm ciii.

O my soul, bless the mother of Jesus Christ; and thou, mine inward parts, glorify her name.

Forget not her benefits, nor her grace, nor her consolations.

Sins are remitted by her grace; and sickness is healed by her mercy.

Bless her, powers of heaven; glorify her, choirs of Apostles and Prophets.

Bless her, seas and isles of the nations; sing a hymn to her, heavens and the inhabitants of the heavens.

Psalm cx.

The Lord has said to our Lady, My mother, sit thou on my right hand.

Goodness and holiness have been loved by thee; therefore thou shalt reign with me in eternity.

An immortal crown shall encircle thy sacred head: and its glory and its splendour will never be extinguished.

Have pity upon us, O Lady, mother of light and glory! enlighten us, Queen of truth and virtue.

Draw from thy treasures, and give us the wisdom of God, and the intelligence of wisdom, and the law of discipline.

Psalm cxxx.

From the depths of the abyss have I cried unto thee, O Lady, listen to my voice.

Let thine ears be attentive to the song of thy praise and thy glory.

Deliver me from the hand of mine enemies; confound their talent, and the efforts they make against me.

Save me in the evil day; and at the moment of death forget not my soul.

Conduct me to the gate of salvation, and let my name be inscribed among the just.

CANTICLES.

I. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of Isaiah.

(*Isa.* xii.)

I will confess to thee, O Lady, because, thanks to thee, the Lord has been appeased concerning me; and thou hast consoled me.

Behold, Lady, my salvation; I shall act with confidence in thee and I shall not fear;

For thou art my strength and my salvation in the Lord; thou hast been for me the assurance of regeneration.

I shall joyfully draw the waters from the source, and I shall always invoke thy name.

Let all the people know the virtues of our Lady, for her name is eminently raised.

Sing and applaud her, all mankind, because the Lord thy God has given you such a mediatrix.

Glory, &c.

II. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of Hezekiah.

(*Isa.* xxxviii.)

I have said towards the middle of my days, I will go to Mary, so that she may reconcile me with Christ.

I have passed the rest of my years in the bitterness of my heart.

My relations have been taken from me; my father and my mother and all creatures have abandoned me; but Mary has raised me up.

I have hoped in her in the morning, the evening, and at noon day; as the lion she has broken all the bones of my sins.

And thou, Lady, thou hast saved my soul that it should not perish; and thou hast snatched me from the tooth of the dog.

Lady, save me, and I will sing thy praise all the days of my life, O pious mother of my Lord.

Glory, &c.

III. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of Anne.

(*Reg.* i.—ii.)

My heart rejoiceth in the Lord; and my soul is exalted in our Lady,

Because the Almighty has done great things in me, by Mary his mother.

There is no saint like our Lady, who alone surpasses all others.

Away from our mouth the old words: let us speak in a new tongue.

Rejoice, praise Mary, Jerusalem and Zion, for she is the greatest of all the women of Israel.

She makes poor, and she makes rich; she humbles and she raises up,

Higher than the heavens, wider than the earth, such is our Lady.

Glory, &c.

IV. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of Mary.

(*Exod.* xv.)

Let us sing of our glorious Lady the Virgin Mary: let us bless her in our hymns and in our canticles.

Our Lady, her name is all powerful after that of God; she has overthrown the chariot of Pharaoh, and all his army in the sea.

Thy right hand, O Lady, is glorified in its strength; because, in the multitude of thy mercies, thou hast thrown mine enemies down to the ground.

Thou hast delivered me from the mouth of the lion, Lady; and thou hast taken me as a mother takes the child which she has brought forth.

O beloved Lady, cover me with thy protection, as the hen does for her chickens.

I am wholly thine, and all that I have is thine, Virgin, blessed above all things.

I will place thee as a seal upon my heart, for thy love is strong as death.

Glory, &c.

V. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of Habakkuk.

(*Hab.* iii.)

Lady, I have heard what has been said of thee, and I have

been amazed; I have considered thy works, and I have trembled.

Lady, the great work in the midst of times, it was thou who accomplished.

I will confess thee, Lady; because thou hast hid these things from the wise, and thou hast revealed them unto babes.

Thy glory hath covered the heavens, and the earth is full of thy mercy.

Thou art born, O Virgin, for the salvation of thy people, for their salvation through thy Christ.

O blessed Virgin, thou savest whom thou wilt, and he from whom thou turnest thy face dies.

Glory, &c.

VI. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of Moses.

(Deut. xxxiii.)

Heavens, listen to what I am going to say of Mary; let the earth attend to the words of my mouth.

Glorify her always with me; let us extol her name from generation to generation.

Perfidious and perverse generation, know our Lady as the way of salvation.

Is she not thy mother, she who has possessed thee, and brought thee up to the faith?

If you abandon her, you are not the friend of the Sovereign Cæsar; at the last day he will not save you without her.

Oh, that it might please God that you might have wisdom and understanding, and that you might look forward to the most important moment.

As the child cannot live without its nurse, so you cannot obtain your salvation without our Lady.

Let thy soul, then, thirst for her; attach thyself to her, and leave her not until she has blessed thee.

Let thy mouth be filled with her praise; sing all day of her magnificence.

Glory, &c.

VII. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of the Children in the Furnace.

(Dan. iii.)

Bless, works, the Creator, bless our glorious Lady; praise her, extol her, throughout all ages.

Angels, bless our Lady; heavens, bless our Lady.

Let all nature bless our Lady; she whom the King would see thus blessed.

Blessed be thou, O daughter of the sovereign King, who surpassest the perfume of lilies.

Blessed be thou, crown of all women; blessed be thou, glory of Jerusalem.

Thy perfume is as a fertile field that the Lord has blessed, it is shed upon those who bless thee, and overflows their inmost heart.

Let him who shall have blessed thee, O most blessed Virgin, be suitably blessed now also.

Let him who shall have cursed thee, most sincere Rose, be equally cursed.

Never let abundance of wine and oil depart from the house of thy servants.

At thy name let every knee bend in heaven, upon earth, and in hell.

Let us bless the God who has created thee; let the parents who brought thee forth be blessed.

Blessed be thou, O Lady, in heaven and on earth; praised, and glorified, and extolled be thou from generation to generation.

Amen.

VIII. *Canticle.*

In imitation of that of Zachariah.

(Zac. i.)

Blessed be thou, mother of the God of Israel, who by thee hast visited and redeemed his people.

He has exalted the salutary horn of thy chastity, in the house of David his servant.

As he had spoken by the mouth of Isaiah, and of other saints his prophets.

Save us from our enemies, and from the hand of those who hate us, Virgin of Virgins, and grant us peace.

And be merciful to our parents, and to us; and remember the oath of the Almighty God:

Which he sware to our fathers, to Abraham, and to his seed for ever.

That we being delivered from the hand of our enemies, may serve him without fear and in peace;

In holiness and in righteousness, in thy presence all the days of our life.

And thou, Mary, shalt be called the Prophetess of God;

for thou hast known that he regarded the lowliness of his servant.

By whom he has given the knowledge of salvation to his people, for the remission of sins.

By the depths of thine abundant mercy visit us, star of the morning, whom thou hast raised in the heavens!

Give light to those who sit in the darkness of the shadow of death, and deign to dissipate it by the light of thy beloved Son.

Have pity, Mother of mercy, have pity upon us sinners, who neglect to repent of our past sins, and who commit each day a great number, for which we have to do penance.

Glory, &c.

Hymn.

Like that which is attributed to St. Ambrose and St. Augustine.

Te Deum.

We praise thee, O Mother of God; we acknowledge thee to be Virgin Mary.

All the earth doth worship thee, the spouse of the Eternal Father.

It is thou whom all the angels, and all the archangels, all thrones, and all principalities, serve faithfully.

Thee all powers, all the virtues of the heavens, all dominions obey.

Thee all choirs, all cherubim and seraphim assist in the exaltation of joy.

Thee every angelic creature proclaims with an unceasing voice.

Holy, holy, holy, Mary, Mother of God, Mother and Virgin.

The heavens and the earth are full of the glorious majesty of the fruit of thy body.

The glorious choir of the Apostles praise thee in concert, as the Mother of the Creator.

Thee the army of the happy martyrs, clad in white robes, glorify as the Mother of Christ.

Thee the glorious army of confessors call the temple of the Trinity.

Thee the delightful choir of virgins proclaim as the model of virginity and humility.

Thee all the celestial court honours as its queen.

Thee the universal church everywhere celebrates in its invocations.

Mother of the Divine majesty:
Honourable and true Mother of the King of heaven:
Holy as well as mild and pious;
Thou, the queen of angels.
Thou, the gate of paradise.
Thou, the ladder to the celestial kingdom and to glory.
Thou, the ark of piety and grace.
Thou, the artery of mercy.
Thou, the spouse and the mother of the eternal King.
Thou, the temple and the sanctuary of the Holy Spirit.
Thou, the noble tabernacle of the blessed Trinity.
Thou, the mediatrix of God and of men; thou, full of love to mortals; thou, celestial illuminatrix.
Thou, the champion of the combatants; the advocate of the poor; the mercy and refuge of sinners.
Thou, the distributrix of favours, the barrier and the terror of the naughty demons.
Thou, the Sovereign of the world, the Queen of heaven; after God, our only hope.
Thou, the salvation of those who call upon thee, the door of the shipwrecked, the consolation of the miserable, the refuge of those who perish.
Thou, the mother of all the elect, their perfect joy after God; thou, the delight of all the citizens above.
Thou, who advancest the just, and who bringest back those who stray.
Thou, the promise of the patriarchs; thou, the truth of the prophets.
Thou, the herald and the teacher of the apostles; thou, the mistress of the evangelists.
Thou, the strength of the martyrs; the example of the confessors; the honour and the joy of the virgins.
Thou, who, to deliver man from exile, hast received the Son of God into thy bosom.
Through thee the old enemy has been conquered, and the kingdom of heaven has been opened to the faithful.
Thou art seated with thy Son at the right hand of the Father.
O thou, Virgin Mary, pray for us to Him who we believe will come to judge us.
O thou, we supplicate thee, come then to our succour, we, thy servants, who have been saved by the precious blood of thy Son.
Make us, O pious virgin, to be numbered with thy saints in glory everlasting.

Save thy people, O our Lady, to the end that we may be partakers of the heritage of thy Son.

And conduct us and guard us for eternity. Every day, O pious Virgin, we salute thee;

And we would praise thee with the voice and with the heart to eternity.

Deign, O sweet Mary, now and ever, to keep us without sin.

Have pity on us, pious Queen, have pity on us. Let thy mercy be great upon us, because we have put our confidence in thee, Virgin Mary.

It is in thee, sweet Mary, that we hope; defend us throughout eternity.

To thee is due praise, to thee is due empire, to thee is due power and glory, from generation to generation.

Amen.

THE CREED.

Whosoever will be saved, should before all things have a firm faith about the Virgin Mary.

And if he keep not this faith whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

For alone Mary has conceived, remaining alway a virgin; she alone has put down all heresies.

Let him be confounded and blush, the Jew who said that Christ was born of Joseph.

Let the Manichean be confounded who said that Christ has an imaginary body.

Let him be cursed, who said that Jesus has taken his body otherwise than through Mary.

For the same Son, who is the only Son of the Father in the Divine ordinance, is the true only Son of the Virgin Mary.

In the heavens he is without mother, upon earth he is without father.

For as the reasonable soul and flesh, united, is born one man; so the Christ, God and man, is truly born of Mary.

He has clothed his flesh with the flesh of the Virgin, for it became him thus to save the human race.

He who, according to his divinity, is equal to the Father, according to his humanity is inferior to the Father;

Conceived in the bosom of the Virgin Mary, by the annunciation of the angel, and by the operation of the Holy Spirit, nevertheless the Holy Spirit is not his father.

He is come into the world without the Virgin Mary suffering

in her flesh, because he was conceived without her having pleasure in the flesh.

His mother fed him from her paps filled by heaven.

The angels surrounded him at his birth, and announced to the shepherds this great joy.

He has been adored, and has received presents from the Magi; he has been made to fly into Egypt by Herod.

He has been baptized in Jordan by John; he has been delivered, then scourged, crucified; he is dead, and he has been buried.

He is raised with glory, and he is ascended into the heavens.

He has sent his Holy Spirit upon his disciples and upon his mother, whom he has at length himself raised to heaven; she there sits at the right hand of her Son, never ceasing to pray for us.

This is the faith of the Virgin Mary, and no one, if he does not believe it faithfully and firmly, can be saved.

LITANIES OF THE BLESSED VIRGIN MARY.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Christ, hear us.

Christ, favourably hear us.

God the Father, who art in heaven, glorious Creator of Mary, have pity upon us.

God the Son, Redeemer of the world, by whom Mary has known maternity, have pity upon us.

God the Holy Spirit, who has covered Mary with thy sacred shadow, have pity upon us.

Holy Trinity, one only God, who glorifiest Mary, have pity upon us.

Holy Mary, who enlightenest the whole universe, pray for us.

Holy Mary, who exaltest thy servants, pray for us.

Holy Mary, who intercedest for sinners, pray for us.

Holy Mary, who enlightenest the heart, pray for us.

Holy Mary, source of mercy, pray for us.

Holy Mary, splendour of the holy church, pray for us.

Holy Mary, flower of wisdom, pray for us.

Holy Mary, saluted by the angel, pray for us.

Holy Mary, who has been covered with the shadow of the Holy Spirit, pray for us.

Holy Mary, glorified in the heavens, pray for us.

Holy Mary, beautiful rose of spring, pray for us.
Holy Mary, fruitful vine, and ornamented with leaves, pray for us.
Holy Mary, mild and beautiful Virgin, pray for us.
Holy Mary, cherished spouse of God the Father, pray for us.
Holy Mary, predestinated Mother of the Word of God, pray for us.
Holy Mary, enveloped by the Holy Spirit, pray for us.
Holy Mary, who conceived God in thy womb, pray for us.
Holy Mary, who hast brought forth a God man, pray for us.
Holy Mary, virgin standard bearer of virgins, pray for us.
Holy Mary, stem of Jesse, who hast borne Christ, pray for us.
Holy Mary, tree of life, who givest fruit, pray for us.
Holy Mary, the most beautiful of women, pray for us.
Holy Mary, the most humble of the humble, pray for us.
Holy Mary, the most holy of saints, pray for us.
Holy Mary, the most precious to love, pray for us.
Holy Mary, the most worthy to be specially praised, pray for us.
Holy Mary, Mother of the Creator, pray for us.
Holy Mary, Mother of the Redeemer, pray for us.
Holy Mary, Mother of the Saviour, pray for us.
Holy Mary, the desired Mother of the earth, pray for us.
Holy Mary, terrible to the powers of hell, pray for us.
Holy Mary, most amiable Mother, pray for us.
Holy Mary, virgin full of grace, pray for us.
Holy Mary, virgin full of clemency, pray for us.
Holy Mary, who spreadest pious consolations, pray for us.
Holy Mary, flower of virgin honour, pray for us.
Holy Mary, flower of wisdom, pray for us.
Holy Mary, splendour and light of the east, pray for us.
Holy Mary, Queen of the virtues of the heavens, pray for us.
Holy Mary, house of the cypress of the Lord, pray for us.
Holy Mary, crystalline window of heaven, pray for us.
Holy Mary, dawn of eternal light, pray for us.
Holy Mary, most beautiful and most honoured Virgin, pray for us.
Holy Mary, sweet and sonorous melody, pray for us.
Holy Mary, who nourishest us with the delights of God, pray for us.
Holy Mary, cupbearer of the celestial court, pray for us.
Holy Mary, open door of Paradise, pray for us.
Holy Mary, beloved shadow of God, pray for us.
Holy Mary, new joy of virgins, pray for us.

Holy Mary, the first blessed among women, pray for us.
Holy Mary, pious consolation of the miserable, pray for us.
Holy Mary, true salvation and true beatitude, pray for us.
Holy Mary, grandeur of charity, pray for us.
Holy Mary, fulness of piety, pray for us.
Holy Mary, mother of the orphans, pray for us.
Holy Mary, nurse of the orphans, pray for us.
Holy Mary, milk of little children, pray for us.
Holy Mary, consolatrix of the afflicted, pray for us.
Holy Mary, whom the angels serve and revere, pray for us.
Holy Mary, noble Queen of the heavens, pray for us.
Holy Mary, with whom both male and female saints partake their joys, pray for us.
Holy Mary, whom all praise and venerate, pray for us.
Be favourable to us, pardon us, O Lady.
Be favourable to us, deliver us, O Lady.
From all evil, deliver us, O Lady.
From all evil temptation, deliver us, O Lady.
From the anger and indignation of God, deliver us, O Lady.
From peril and despair, deliver us, O Lady.
From the pride which ruins, deliver us, O Lady.
From the sharp sin of anger and of envy, deliver us, O Lady.
From the temptation of the flesh, which solicits us on all sides, deliver us, O Lady.
From the shameful sin of gormandizing and of gluttony, deliver us, O Lady.
From the assault of the evil enemy, deliver us, O Lady.
By thy joy at the incarnation of Christ, deliver us, O Lady.
By the sorrow and agony of his passion, deliver us, O Lady.
By the joy and the miracle of his resurrection, deliver us, O Lady.
By the joy and delight of thy coronation, deliver us, O Lady.
By thy faith in the mission of the Holy Spirit, deliver us, O Lady.
By the joy and delight of his ascension, deliver us, O Lady.
In the severe examination of the judgment, deliver us, O Lady.
At the devastating and desolate hour of our death, deliver us, O Lady.

From the horrible torments of hell, deliver us, O Lady.

We sinners entreat thee, hear us.

That, most pious Queen, thou wouldst deign to preserve the holy Church, we entreat thee to listen to us.

That thou wilt deign to obtain glory for the just, and pardon for the sinners, we entreat thee to hear us.

That thou wilt deign to obtain consolation for the afflicted, liberty for the captives, we entreat thee to hear us.

That thou wilt deign to console the servants and the handmaids that devotedly serve thee, we entreat thee to hear us.

That thou wilt deign to keep thy Christian people, saved by the precious blood of thy Son, we entreat thee to hear us.

That thou wilt deign to grant to the faithful dead eternal rest, we entreat thee to hear us.

Mother of God, we entreat thee to hear us.

Well beloved Mother, our Lady, have pity upon us, and give us perpetual peace. Amen.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Christ, have mercy upon us.

Lord, have mercy upon us.

Our Father, &c., and let us not fall into temptation, but deliver us from evil.

V. I have said, O Lady; have pity upon me.

R. Heal my soul, for I have sinned against thee.

V. Turn thy mercy upon us.

R. And be propitious to thy servants.

V. Display thy power against our enemies.

R. To the end that thou mayest be justified before all nations.

V. Have mercy on thy servants who call upon thy name.

R. And leave them not a prey to their temptations.

V. Reject us not at the time of our death.

R. And succour our soul when it shall have left our body.

V. Be to us a tower of strength.

R. And an impregnable rock against the enemy.

V. Aid me, O Lady, that I yield not to him.

R. Bruise thou him beneath my feet.

V. Favourably hear my prayer and my supplication.

R. And let mine adversaries be brought to nought.

End of the Psalter.

This work is published in Latin, in French, and in Italian; this last with the approval of the authorities at Rome. I have at least a dozen successive editions.

Now if streams are the purest near to the fountain, may we not presume that the worship of the Romish Church is most correctly practised under the superintendence of the Pope; and that if we are to find the purest exponent of Roman Catholic theology, it will be where censors of books are appointed to see that nothing erroneous passes through the press, and where the Pope, assuming the attribute of infallibility, inspects the publication, adds to it his signature, and pronounces it calculated to edify and instruct the faithful? We therefore contend that we have made out a charge of undiluted idolatry against the Church of Rome; and either she must renounce those books as unscriptural and abominable, and proclaim herself fallible and guilty, or we Protestants must continue to bless God, who has emancipated our worship from her pollutions, and to labour by every scriptural effort to bring the victims of that dreadful superstition to the knowledge of those truths, which would fall like sunbeams amid the darkness of the Vatican:—"God is a Spirit. There is one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

But some one will ask, "How can the Church of Rome justify this monstrous idolatry, both as it refers to saints and the Virgin Mary, or as it applies to the images of them? How can Roman Catholics endure these practices, when there are such express prohibitions of them in the word of God?

Practically the word of God is to Roman Catholics a sealed book and a dead letter. They are permitted to read it with certain restrictions; but the con-

ditions are so complex and so strict that they amount to an actual prohibition of perusing it with any profitable or valuable result. And the books which in Ireland and on the Continent are practically substituted for the Bible, are what are called the Catechisms of the Roman Catholic Church, from one of which, the 'Abridgment of Christian Doctrine,' by the celebrated Dr. Doyle, we will quote the Ten Commandments as evidence of what we say.

"*Q.* Say the Ten Commandments." "*A.* 'I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have no strange gods; thou shalt not have an idol, or any figure to adore.' Second. 'Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.'"

This is the case in Ireland; and on the Continent the very same thing takes place. In an Italian Catechism, called *Dottrina Christina*, commended by Pope Clement VIII., and drawn up by the celebrated Cardinal Bellarmine, and revised and approved by the Congregation of Sacred Rites, and appointed for the use of the faithful, dated Rome, 1836, printed with the licence and the privilege of the superiors, the Ten Commandments begin thus:—"First. I am the Lord thy God; thou shalt have none other gods before me. Second. Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain." And as in Italy the light is less than in Ireland, they take leave, not only to exclude the second commandment, but to tamper with the fourth; and this accounts for the painful and universal fact, that throughout the whole Continent of Europe the Sabbath day is almost universally extinguished! The fourth commandment stands in the Catechism, not, "Remember the Sabbath Day to keep it holy, six days shalt thou labour," and so on; but, "Remember to keep holy the festivals (*le feste*)." This is indeed "teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

The reason of all this cannot be misunderstood. The alternative was before the Church of Rome either to bring her practices up to God's word (which was her duty), or to bring down God's word to the level of her practices. She, worthy of the name and the principles of a corrupt and apostate communion, has brought down God's most Holy Word to the level of her most unholy practices. She felt that it rebuked her, and prophesied evil concerning her while she continued in her sins, and she has therefore extinguished the testimony of the prophet, lest her misguided people should catch a gleam of celestial day, and awaken to a just view of that fearful superstition, in which vital truth has been crushed, and holy principles have been desecrated and defiled.

To show that the Church of Rome does not scruple at making God's word speak what will favour her practices, I quote a passage from a celebrated Catechism to which we have already referred—the 'Abridgment of Christian Doctrine,' p. 119:—*Q.* "Is it lawful to honour the angels and saints?" "*A.* Yes." "*Q.* How prove you that?" "*A.* Revelation xix. 10: 'And I fell down, said he, to worship before the feet of the angel, which shewed me these things.'" Here the proof ends. With fearful tact, she tries to vindicate her dreadful practice by leaving out the remainder of the text, which contains all the meaning: "And he said unto me, See thou do it *not:* I am thy fellow-servant. Worship *God.*"

The Church of Rome appeals, indeed, to several portions of Scripture in vindication of these idolatrous practices, and alleges that she is warranted in invocating and worshipping the saints by express passages of Holy Writ. To these I must now call your attention.

When we tell a Roman Catholic, what seems to

us plain and obvious common sense, that we cannot conceive how, if a saint in heaven be a creature—the Virgin Mary, for instance (glorified and beatified, as we believe her to be, saved by the Redeemer's blood, and not in virtue of her own merit), and, by the very definition of a creature, restricted to one locality—she can hear the prayers offered to her at the same moment in London, in Paris, in Rome, in St. Petersburg, and attend to the wants of all her suppliants; and when we add that we have no reason for believing that the saints in heaven are directly cognisant of prayers offered up on earth (not disputing that they may be informed of them), or that they are able to reply to them, the Roman Catholic instantly lays his finger on the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel of Luke, and says, there is evidence that the angels in heaven do hear and know what is doing upon earth, for he reads: "I say unto you, There is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." Therefore, he says, the saints around the throne know what is transacting in our world, and it is not in vain to pray to them: they know it is here expressly declared, when a sinner repents. Now, let us refer to the whole passage; and instead of vindicating the Romish practice, it will be found distinctly to support the Protestant doctrine. "Then drew near unto him all the publicans and sinners, for to hear him. And the Pharisees and scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them. And he spake this parable unto them, saying, What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it? And when he hath found it, he layeth it on his shoulders, rejoicing. And when he cometh home, he calleth together his friends and neigh-

bours, saying unto them, Rejoice with me, for I have found my sheep which was lost. I say unto you, that likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons, which need no repentance." That is to say, as the man who has found his sheep which was lost calls together his friends, and tells them of the fact, that they may rejoice with him, so God proclaims amid the choirs of the angels and of the saints in heaven, what they are ignorant of, that some poor sinner has repented; and then they rejoice, not because they see what is done upon earth, but because they are told by Him who has no pleasure in the death, but only in the repentance of His people.

Another passage quoted by Roman Catholics in favour of this tenet of theirs, is in Genesis xlviii. 15: "And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day, the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." The Roman Catholic disputant quotes the latter clause: "The angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads;" but he omits the preceding part of the sentence, which, in fact, determines the meaning of it. For it is evidently the same personage, who in the first limb of the sentence is called, "God before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk;" in the second limb, "the God which fed me all my life long unto this day;" and in the third limb, "the angel which redeemed me from all evil." When we take this in connection with the fact, that Christ is called in the Old Testament Scriptures, "the angel of the covenant;" and that in the third chapter of Exodus, "the angel of the Lord" appeared in the burning bush, and assumed and appropriated the name peculiar to Deity, viz., Jehovah, we see at once that "the angel" spoken of by Jacob is the

Angel Jehovah, "the brightness of the Father's glory, and the express image of His person."

Another passage quoted by Roman Catholics in defence of the worship of saints, is Hosea xii. 4: "Yea, he (Jacob) had power over the angel, and prevailed; he wept, and made supplication unto him; he found him in Bethel, and there he spake with us;" and the Roman Catholic stops there, instead of adding the words that follow: "even the Lord God of Hosts; the Lord is his memorial." It was no created angel, but "the Lord God of Hosts;" and nothing but mutilation of sacred Scripture makes any other meaning.

We will now proceed to adduce some passages of Scripture that bear more directly upon it. Let us first show that there is recognised in Scripture but one Mediator between God and us. (1 Timothy ii. 5.) "There is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus." Just as it is a cardinal doctrine of natural religion that there is one God, so it is a cardinal doctrine of Christianity or revealed religion, that there is one Mediator. (John vi. 68.) "Lord, to whom shall we go?" to saints, to angels, to seraphim, to cherubim? no; "*thou* hast the words of eternal life." (John xiv. 6.) "Jesus saith unto him, I am the way, and the truth, and the life; no man cometh unto the Father but by me;" neither by saint, nor angel, nor cherubim, but "by me." (Acts iv. 12.) "Neither is there salvation in any other, for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved, but the name of Jesus Christ." Would that these words were written upon the altars, and upon the doors, and lintels, and garments, and whole ritual of Rome; would they were inscribed by the Holy Ghost on the people's hearts. (Ephesians ii. 18.) "For through him we both have access by one Spirit

unto the Father." We Protestants, therefore, *must* be safe, while Roman Catholics (to take the most favourable view) *may* be wrong, for they are trying to find admission to the Father by doors that we dare not attempt, and which we believe never have been opened, or at least are nailed up from the fall. (1 John ii. 1.) "If any man sin, we have," what? ten thousand saints and mediators? no; but an advocate with the Father, "Jesus Christ the righteous;" and He is our advocate on the only basis, viz., His atonement, on which intercession can have any virtue, for "he is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." (Hebrews vii. 25.) "He is able to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him." Protestants are therefore safe, for they "come unto God by Christ" only, and He is "able to save *such* to the uttermost." What is the limit of "uttermost?" Infinitude itself. And if Protestants are "saved to the uttermost by Christ," what need of the intercession and assistance of the Virgin Mary and other saints? (Hebrews xii. 24.) "Ye are come" (at once, without intervention,) "to Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling."

In the next place, we have no warrant whatever in Scripture to pray to saints that are in glory. Christ's command is (Matthew vi. 28) not, "Come unto Mary," or "Come unto angels, or to saints," but "Come unto ME, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Again, John xiv. 13: "Whatsoever ye shall ask *in my name*, that will I do." And again: "Whosoever shall call on *the name of the Lord* shall be saved." And again: "Ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry," what? "Hail, Mary?" "O blessed Joseph, hear us?" "O queen of Heaven, deliver us?"

no; but—"whereby we cry, Abba, Father," at once, directly, and without the intervention of any but Christ the Mediator. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father!"

Again, what is prayer? Prayer is a sacrifice, just as praise is a sacrifice. Not a *propitiatory* sacrifice; there is but one propitiatory sacrifice; but praise and prayer and almsgiving are all sacrifices. Now where only must sacrifices be offered? On an altar. But what altar have we? Not the miserable mimicry of altars raised within the pale of the Roman Catholic communion; these are altars that a mouse may undermine, that a hammer will destroy, that time will overthrow; but we have an Altar whose base is the circumference of the earth, or rather whose centre or apex is everywhere, and whose circumference is nowhere; and on this Altar we are to lay our praises and our prayers and our thanksgivings, knowing that it is the Altar that sanctifies the gift, and makes both acceptable to God. And as it is to God that all sacrifice must be offered even on Roman Catholic principles, we see at once, that as praise and prayer are spiritual sacrifices, we are to lift them up to God only, upon Christ the only Altar.

In the next place, there is no evidence whatever that the saints in heaven have any cognisance *directly* of what is doing upon earth. Ecclesiastes ix. 5. "The living know that they shall die, but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward, for the memory of them is forgotten; also their love, and their hatred, and their envy is now perished, neither have they any more a portion for ever in anything that is done under the sun." (2 Kings ii. 9.) "And Elijah said unto Elisha, Ask what I shall do for thee *before* I shall be taken away

from thee;" implying that when admitted into Heaven he could do nothing for him, and all that he did for him must be done before he was taken from earth. God speaks thus to the good king Josiah (2 Kings xxii. 20): "Behold, I will gather thee unto thy fathers, and thou shalt be gathered into thy grave in peace, and thine eyes *shall not see* all the evil which I will bring upon this place." (Job xiv. 20.) "His sons come to honour, and he knoweth it not." (Isaiah lxiii. 16.) "Thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us."

Let us now turn to passages which expressly repudiate all worshipping of saints or angels. Colossians ii. 18. "Let no man beguile you of your reward, in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen." (Hebrews i. 14.) "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" not to receive their prayers, but to minister for them according to the bidding of God. "I fell down," says John, "before the feet of the angel which showed me these things; then saith he unto me, See thou do it not, for I am thy fellow servant; worship *God*."

With respect to the Virgin Mary, the great object of Roman Catholic idolatry, we can show that all worship to her is interdicted and forbidden in Scripture.

The Romanist quotes the text,—"All generations shall call me blessed;" and argues that she is therefore entitled to a homage and a veneration altogether peculiar and *sui generis;* such, in short, as that of which we have given specimens. What proves too much, fails to prove the point for which it is quoted. We read, "*Blessed* are the meek;" "*Blessed* are they that mourn;" "*Blessed* are they that hear the word of God and keep it;" but do we therefore fall down and worship them? If a person, because pronounced

blessed, is to be worshipped, every Christian must fall down and worship his neighbour in the strains in which the Roman Catholic adores the Virgin Mary. But it may be said, there is a peculiar blessedness ascribed to the Virgin Mary; for it is written of her, "Blessed art thou *among* women," obviously selecting Mary as the object of peculiar and distinguished blessedness. If this principle be admitted, we prove it the duty of the Roman Church to take down every statue and picture of the Virgin, and put up the picture of another in its place; for we read in Judges v. 24: "Blessed *above* women shall Jael, the wife of Heber, the Kenite, be." If Mary is to be worshipped because she is pronounced "blessed *among* women," *à fortiori* should Jael be worshipped, for she is blessed *above* women; and the Roman Catholic Church would take a step towards a more scriptural worship, if she were to expunge the name of Mary from every Litany, and to substitute the name of Jael, the wife of Heber, the Kenite.

Moreover, there are passages in Scripture so expressly and distinctly bearing against the invocation of Mary, that there can scarcely be a doubt that our blessed Lord not only saw the awful idolatry which would obtain upon this very subject, but made special provision in the Scriptures against it—a most remarkable evidence of the truth and inspiration of the Scriptures. On every occasion in which the Virgin Mary is introduced in the Bible, our Lord says something calculated to repress any disposition to worship, or to attach supernatural claims to her person. Mary herself proves that she felt she was saved, not because she was the mother of the Saviour's flesh, but because she had "washed her robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." She sings, with the faith, humility, and joy of a true believer, "My Soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath re-

joiced in God *my Saviour;*" but who needs a "Saviour?" A sinner. Mary, notwithstanding the epithet "immaculate," which the Church of Rome bestows upon her, owned herself a sinner, and a sinner that sought mercy and acceptance at the feet of the Saviour of sinners. On one occasion we read (Luke ii. 27), that "a certain woman of the company lift up her voice and said unto him, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the paps which thou hast sucked.'" The principle and germ of the Marian worship was in that woman's heart. What did our Lord say? Did he say, "Let her be the empress of the earth, let her be the queen of heaven; by all means come to me through her?" No; but he said, "Yea, rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God and keep it." What a sublime and magnificent rebuke! yet, like Christ's severest rebukes, bearing a blessing in the heart of it. And how should we pray that every Roman Catholic should feel this blessed truth, that the man who hears God's word in the depths of his heart, and does it, is more blessed in so doing than the Virgin Mary was in being selected to be the mother of our Lord according to the flesh! On another occasion (Matthew xii. 47), we find the same disposition to check and crush the first approach to Marian worship:—"One said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee. But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And he stretched forth his hand towards his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren; for whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." A clear and decisive intimation, that all the affinities which existed between the Son of God and his virgin mother, were in the estimate of heaven, and for the purposes of

our salvation, practically extinguished for ever; and that the only bond which can now knit the sinner to the Saviour, is faith in his blood, and cordial repose in his perfect righteousness,—Christ within our hearts the hope of glory. And, says the apostle, to confirm this: "Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given amongst men, whereby we must be saved."

Mary made no atonement for the sins of the world, and therefore is destitute of anything like a valid plea on which to raise the superstructure of an effectual intercession.

There is no room for the interposing mediation of the Virgin Mary, were she willing and able. What is Christ? He is God-Man. As such he is a perfect pathway to glory. Sin made a chasm between the absolutely holy God and the guilty and ruined creature, and the Lord Jesus Christ, by his death, removed sin, which is the separating element between God and us, and introduced himself as the bridge, the pathway, the glorious ladder, connecting heaven and earth. Christ is God, on the one hand, and can hold communion with God; and he is man, on the other, and can hold communion with man. There is, then, no room for the Virgin Mary between Christ and God, for he is God, and in close contact with God; and there is no room for the Virgin Mary between Christ and man, for he is very man, in close contact with man, entering into the depths of our sympathies, conversant with the sources of our tears; and, therefore, from the throne of God, enshrined amid glory unutterable, down to the lowest depths of human ruin, there is no room for the Virgin Mary, for Christ spans the whole chasm, and forms a pathway so glorious that the greatest sinner may walk in it, and yet so holy that the least sin is not tolerated in it.

It is also evident from our Lord's recorded re-

buke to Mary herself, what is his own mind on this solemn subject. In the second chapter of the Gospel of St. John, we find Mary, at the wedding feast, exhibiting those sinful feelings of pride by which many a Mary is still characterised. On seeing that her relatives had not wine enough to supply all the guests that had been invited, and fearing lest the poverty of a relative's feast should be exposed, she said, in delicate but intelligible terms, "They have no wine;" meaning thereby that Christ should work a miracle to gratify her pride. What did our Lord reply? "Woman" (the language of respect), "what have I to do with thee?" as much as to say, I must tread the wine-press alone; even a mother's tears must not mingle with the expiatory blood of redemption; of the people there must be none with me; in the great work of atonement I have nothing to do with thee; thou neither hast, nor art able to have any share here. Mary's privilege it was to listen to his gracious words, and Mary's advice it was, "What he saith unto you, do." One would suppose that such a rebuke as this would extinguish all pretexts and apologies for the Marian worship on the part of Roman Catholics. But what do they do? They present, in connection with this, another awful specimen of tampering with God's word. The very same Greek words, which we here translate, "What have I to do with thee?" occur again in Mark v. 7, when the demon said to our Lord, "What have I to do with thee, Jesus, thou Son of the Most High God?" Now, in this latter passage, the Church of Rome translates these words just as we do; but in the former (John ii.), where a clear rebuke of their idolatry is implied, they have translated the words in a way that destroys the rebuke, by destroying their meaning;—"Woman, what is it to thee and to me?" How is it, that in the one passage, where a mere historical inci-

dent is concerned, the Church of Rome translates the words one way, and this way full of obvious meaning, and in the other passage, where the worship of the Virgin Mary is reproved, that Church translates the words in another way, and renders them utterly unintelligible? The reason is obvious: the worship of the Virgin Mary is just that point on which the Church of Rome seems, like the idolaters of old, "mad upon their idols;" and because God's word rebukes it, she will rather abandon and corrupt the truths of that word, than abandon her own corrupt and idolatrous worship.

Throughout the whole of Scripture, we find our blessed Lord exhibited as the Saviour of the people, and in no one instance is the Virgin Mary thus set forth. Heaven and earth witness constantly to Jesus Christ. If we ask the apostle Paul, who is to be the great object of our hope and faith, he answers: "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." If we appeal to the dying martyr Stephen in the immediate prospect of a judgment seat, his departing cry was (for he died a Protestant, not a Roman Catholic) not, "Mary," but "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." And here I may mention a little incident, illustrative of the intensity of Romish idolatry. A Roman Catholic layman, distinguished for his talent and his scholarship, was laid upon a sick bed; a clergyman of the Church of England and another resolved to call upon him, and when they were admitted, one said, "My dear friend, we have discussed the points at issue between us long enough; now let us have done with controversy, and do just listen to me, while I try to tell you what the blessed gospel is, in which I place all my trust." He consented, and the Protestant tried to preach to him the true atonement, and the true purgatory, and the only sacrifice; and asked, "Cannot you take up the language of dying Stephen, and

if called to leave this bed, and stand before God, would not your last words be, 'Lord Jesus, receive my spirit?' Surely, in the prospect of eternity, Mary won't do." After a deliberate pause, he spoke: "If I had but three minutes to live, my last words would be—Holy Mary, blessed art thou among women, blessed is the fruit of thy womb, pray for me now and in the hour of death."

If we ask the patriarch Job, What are thy hope and glory, the long-tried patriarch replies, "I know that my Redeemer liveth." If we ask the saints around the throne, who is the burden of their song, we hear the anthem peal borne from the celestial choirs, significant of their faith and joy: "Unto him that loved us, and washed us from our sins in his blood, be glory and dominion for ever and ever." If we ask the everlasting Father, who is Christ? we hear the responding voice from heaven, "This is my beloved Son, hear ye him." If the Lord Jesus himself, "I am the way." If the Holy Spirit, he descends like a dove, to bear witness to him and to seal him as Messiah. If angels, what is the theme of their admiration? They exclaim, "Unto you is born a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord;" "into these things we desire to look;" "and let all the angels of God worship him." If we refer to the prophets, "To him give all the prophets witness." If to the Baptist, he gathers up all that had been symbolised and shadowed in the ancient economy, and compresses it into one golden and magnificent ascription, "Behold the Lamb of God, that taketh away the sin of the world." If we ask the Apostles, who it is they preach, "Whom we preach;" "we are witnesses." If we ask the whole Church of Christ the ground of their hope, "To whom shall we go but unto Thee? Thou hast the words of eternal life." If we ask, What mean the sacraments? they are voices in the wilderness, "We are not that Christ,

we bear witness of Him: he must increase, we must decrease." If we appeal to creation around, every rock bears inscribed upon its brow the Rock of Ages: every vine announces the true and living vine; the sun in the firmament tells us of the Sun of Righteousness; the stars set forth the bright and morning Star; and the rose that blooms in the field and garden carries by its fragrance to our hearts, the loveliness of the Rose of Sharon. All creation, all revelation, prophets, saints and martyrs, turn away from Mary and from angels, and concentrate their regard, and converge their attention, and build their songs, upon Jesus and him crucified and crowned. Nay, more; if the Virgin Mary could speak to her Roman Catholic worshippers upon earth, she would give them different advice from that which they now follow.

One beautiful relationship to his Church under which Christ is set forth in Scripture, is that of her everlasting husband; and just mark what this implies: can we suppose that wife was living in harmony with her husband, who, on finding it necessary to obtain money for the supply of her family, should call upon her next-door neighbour, and say, "Will *you* go up to my husband, and ask him to give me five pounds to provide for our family?" When husband and wife live in concord and reciprocal affection, the wife never hesitates herself to tell him what is needed, and he never refuses to give. Now, Christ is our loving and enthroned husband, with ten thousand times a husband's power, and ten thousand times ten thousand times a husband's heart, for his is the heart of hearts; and they that are the members of his body, they that constitute "the Lamb's wife," have only to ask, and he will show that he has infinitely more joy in giving than they have in asking.

VIII.

IMMORAL.

THERE is a celebrated saint named Alphonsus Liguori, who was canonized—that is, enrolled among the Saints in heaven by the pronunciation of the Pope in the year 1839. The congregation of Sacred Rites stated that they had examined his manuscripts and printed works, and that there was "nothing censurable in anything St. Alphonsus Liguori had written." There is in the breviary, and also in the missal, which every Roman Catholic is bound to use —in public worship, in fact, the common prayer of the Church of Rome—the following prayer for the 2nd day of August:—

"Oh God, who by the blessed Alphonsus, thy Confessor and Pontiff, inflamed with the love of souls hast enriched thy Church with a new offspring, we implore that, taught by his instructions, and strength, and by his example, we may be able to come to thee through the Lord."

Every Roman Catholic prays that he may be strengthened by the example and taught by the instructions of the blessed Saint Liguori. The following extract is from a sermon preached by the late Cardinal Wiseman on the 2nd day of August, 1850 (the day of St. Alphonsus Liguori), at the Clapham Roman Catholic chapel. I quote from the 'Tablet,'

the Roman Catholic newspaper, of August 10th, 1850:—

"Friday, August 2, being St. Alphonsus' Day, the Redemptorists had a grand function at Clapham. The Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman preached in the evening. The Bishop took for his text the words, 'The first shall be last and the last first,' and said that among the many applications this passage would bear, there was one which particularly struck him as he was standing beneath the rising walls of a church dedicated to the first—the Mother of Saints, and to the last of the canonized servants of God—St. Alphonsus (Liguori) . . . . The great St. Alphonsus was raised up when minds were confused with controversies and heresies, with clear intellect and delicate hand to trace the thread of traditional truth amid the mazes of error, and to be a beacon to future ages. St. Alphonsus was necessary for an age when all things were infected with a Jansenistic spirit, when confession was made repulsive and difficult, instead of persons being drawn to it as the balm of a wounded spirit. Then St. Alphonsus came to *systematize the sweet devotions* to the passion and the holy childhood of Jesus, the blessed sacrament, and our blessed Lady; not that these devotions are not to be found in St. Bernard and St. Bonaventure; but as a language may be fully formed and perfect without there being either a grammar or dictionary of it, so these devotions were unsystematized, and therefore difficult to acquire; there was no scientific and regular way of approach, they were left to personal experience and personal gifts; but St. Alphonsus has simplified the way for us, *he has provided our grammar and dictionary, and the language may now be easily learned*, and that not only by those who are secluded from the world, but also *by lay persons*. Again, persons now-a-days can happily have no

experience of what confession was before St. Alphonsus; what a harsh and bitter thing the spirit of Jansenism had made it, and how severe were the external penances enjoined; he has so changed the face of the Church that *now there is perhaps not a theological school in the world which would care to give its students any treatise of moral theology opposed to the spirit of St. Alphonso, gentle to past sins, severe to the occasion of them.* What immense influence has he exercised! and yet he is in all senses a saint of modern times, adapted to the wants and to the circumstances of the age, lived in the time of our fathers, and his canonization was but yesterday." This is no mean eulogium of Dr. Wiseman on Liguori.

In the 'Life of St. Alphonsus Liguori,' published by Dolman, 1846, by the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman —that is, the late Cardinal Wiseman—this Alphonsus Liguori and his principles and practices are commended. The Cardinal was so charmed with this saint of 1839, that he wrote his life in 1846, giving its minutest passages, and amongst other things explanatory of his entire sympathy with Liguori, he makes this remark at page 57:—"The lives of extraordinary men are the text-books of all real study and excellence, the charts which we lay down for the tract of virtue. The moral instructions, which in the lives of statesmen and philosophers are obscure and tainted, are in the lives of these holy men, deliberate, clear, and definite."

He then begins his life by stating: "The angelic St. Thomas, the seraphic St. Bonaventure, are the best models wherein to study and explain that system of virtue and perfection which they traced in their works; while St. Alphonsus Liguori is celebrated throughout the world for his theological writings, his great virtues, his extraordinary sanctity,

which proved how close was the connection between the wisdom of his understanding and the purity of his heart."

To show the excellence of this saint, Cardinal Wiseman states that while he preached a discourse upon his favourite subject, the patronage of the blessed Virgin, from her countenance a ray of light like the sun was reflected upon the faces of all present, which shows that the winking of the Virgin of Rimini is not at all a novelty in the experience or history of the Church of Rome. "On that occasion many persons were in tears, many of the women were seized with such intense sorrow that they mounted themselves upon the platform at the preaching of the saint, and began to *discipline* themselves (that is, to scourge themselves with a rod) and cry aloud for mercy." (P. 12.) He states in another passage of the same document that "the Saint's bread was black, and not even leavened, through the inexperience of his lay brethren. This miserable food, which he ate kneeling, or stretched upon the ground, they rendered still more nauseous by sprinkling over it some bitter stuff, and many of them, with the saint among them, licked the floor with their tongues, and disciplined themselves three times in each week." (P. 15.)

He states also that whilst he was preaching on the patronage of the blessed Virgin, and exciting his hearers to look with confidence to her, again a miracle was shown, and every one burst into a flood of tears. He said, "Be glad, for the Virgin has granted your prayers." Cardinal Wiseman says that "his food was of the most inferior kind, and he sprinkled it with wormwood and bitter herbs. Such was his severity in scourging himself, that his friends had to burst open his door, and snatch the discipline (a beautiful canonical name for the

scourge) out of his hands, fearing he might cause his death." (P. 317.) Here was a saint almost a suicide. It is added that St. Alphonsus saw the Virgin, and that "his feelings on the occasion made him compose the 'Glories of Mary.'"

The most celebrated work of this saint is his 'Moral Theology,' dedicated to Benedict XIV. The 'Moral Theology' is published by Burns, London. The work is in nine volumes. This 'Moral Theology' contains, first of all, the following statements:—

"*Scripturæ et libri controversiarum in linguâ vernaculari non permittantur, sine autem permissione legi non possunt.*"

"The Scriptures and books of controversies may not be permitted in the vernacular tongue; as also they cannot be read without permission."

Let us now read St. Liguori's illustrations and appreciations of lying:—

"Interim vero, etsi licitum non est mentiri, seu simulare quod non est, licet tamen dissimulare quod est, sive tegere veritatem verbis, aliisve signis ambiguis et indifferentibus, ob justam causam, et cum non est necessitas fatendi. Est Comm. S. Thom. Kon. dis. 15. dub. 2. n. 9. Laym. 1. 2. t. i. c. 11."

"Notwithstanding, indeed, although it is not lawful to lie, or to feign what is not, however it is lawful to dissemble what is, or to cover the truth with words, or other ambiguous and doubtful signs, for a just cause, and when there is not a necessity of confessing. Est Comm. S. Thom. Kon. dis. 15. dub. 2. n. 9. Laym. 1. 2. t. i. c. 11." [Vol. 2. B. 3. ch. 3. p. 116.]

Then, he says, in the next place:—

"Cum non rogaris de fide, non solum licet, sed sæpe melius est ad Dei honorem, et utilitatem proximi, tegere fidem quamfateri; ut si latens inter hæreticos plus boni facias; vel si ex confessione plus mali sequeretur, verbi gratia, turbatio, neces, exacerbatio tyranni, periculum defectionis, si torquereris. Unde temerarium plerumque est offerre

"When you are not asked concerning the faith, not only is it lawful, but it is often more conducive to the glory of God and the utility of your neighbour, to cover the faith than to confess it; for example, if concealed among heretics you may accomplish a greater amount of good; or, if from the confession of the faith more of evil would follow—

se ultro. S. Th. Sanch. Laym. c. 11. n. 2."

"His positis, certum est et commune apud omnes, quod ex juxta causa licitum sit uti æquivocatione modis expositis, et eam juramento firmare. Ita Less. l. 2. c. 41. n. 47. Card. diss. 19. n. 35. Salm. tr. 17. de Juram. cap. 2. n. 115. ex. S. Hieron. c. 22. q. 2."

"*Hinc infertur*, 1. *Confessarius affirmare potest etiam juramento se nescire peccatum auditum in confessione, subintelligendo ut hominem, non autem ut ministrum Christi, ut docent S. Th.* 2. 2. 9. 70. *Art.* 1. *ad* 1. *Lug. disp.* 22."

"*Et si quis temere petat a confessario, an audierit tale peccatum in confessione, bene potest respondere: Non audivi, scilicet ut homo, vel ad manifestandum.*" Card. cum Lug. n. 66.

"Sed satis probabiliter Lugo de Just. d. 40. n. 15. Tamb. lib. 3. c. 4. § 3. n. 5. Cum Sanch. Viva q. 7. art. 4. n. 2. Sporer de Præc. c. 1. num. 13. item Elbel dict. num. 144. Card. in Propt. Innoc. XI. diss. 19. num. 78. cum Nav. Less. Sa. et Fill. et aliis pluribus dicunt, posse reum, si sibi immineat pœna mortis, vel carceris, aut exilii perpetui, amissionis omnium bonorum, trire-

for example, disturbance, death, the irritation of a tyrant, danger of defection, if you should be tortured: whence it is often hazardous to offer one's self uncalled for. S. Th. Sanc. Laym. c. 11. n. 2." [Vol. 2. ch. 3. p. 117.]

"These things being settled, it is a certain and a common opinion among all divines that for a just cause it is lawful to use equivocation in the modes propounded, and to confirm it (equivocation) with an oath. Less. l. 2. c. 41. n. 47. Card. diss. 19. n. 35. Salm. tr. 17. de Juram. cap. 2. n. 115. ex. S. Hieron. c. 22. p. 2."—[Vol. 2. B. 4. treat. 2. p. 316.]

"Hence it is inferred, first, that a confessor can declare, even upon oath, that he does not know a sin, heard in confession, by understanding *as man*, not *as the minister of Christ*, as St. Thomas, 2. 2. 9. 73. art. 1. ad. 1. Lug. disp. 22. teach."—(Ibid. 319.)

"And if any one rashly should inquire of a confessor whether he may have heard such a confession, he can rightly answer, *I have not heard it*, that is to say, *as a man*, or *for the purpose of making it known*."—Card. cum. Lug. n. 66.

"But probably enough Lugo de Just. d. 40. n. 15. Tamb. lib. 3. c. 4. § 3. n. 5. cum. Sanch. Viva q. 7. art. 4. n. 2. Sporer de Præc. c. 1. num. 13. item Elbel dict. num. 144. Card. in Propt. Innoc. XI. diss. 19. num. 78. cum Nav. Less. Sa. et Fill, with many others, say, that the accused, if threatened with death, or imprisonment, or perpetual exile, the loss of all property, the

mium, et similis, negare crimen, etiam cum juramento, (saltem sine peccato gravi) subintelligendo, *se non commisisse quatenus teneatur illud fateri*, modo sit spes vitandi pœnam."

"Qui mutuum accepit, sed postea satisfecit, potest negare, se accepisse mutuum, subintelligens, *ita ut debeat solvere*. Salm. n. 140. et Sporer de 2. Præc. c. 1. n. 122. cum Suar. Nav. Az. Laym. Sanch. Cov. et aliis."

"Qui venit de loco falso putato infecto, potest negare se venire ex illo, scilicet *ut pestilentia*, quia hæc est mens custodum. Salm. n. 141. Less. cap. 42. n. 47. Sanch. Dec. lib. 3. cap. 6. n. 35. et Sporer, loc. sit. n. 140. cum Tol. Nav. Suar. Henr. Rod. etc."

"Si quis invitatus interrogetur an sit bonus cibus qui revera sit insipidus, potest respondere esse bonum, scilicet *ad mortificationem*."

"*Quæritur* 5, *an famulus ex jussu domini possit negare ipsum esse domi. Card. diss.* 19, *n.* 75. *admittit ipsum posse fingere pedem in limine, et respondere, Non est hic; quia non est restrictio mentalis; sed huic non assentior, si alter nullo modo possit id advertere. Potius concederem, eum posse dicere, Non est hic, scilicet non in hac janua, vel fenestra: vel* (*ut ait Tourn. Mor. tom.* 1, *pag.* 689) *Non est hic quatenus videri possit. Item ait Carden, posse eum respondere, Egressus e domo est, intelligendo in præterito; non enim tenemur, ait cum Less, ut supra, respondere*

galleys, and such like, can deny the crime, even with an oath (at least without great sin), by understanding that he did not commit it, *so that he is bound to confess it*, only let there be a hope of avoiding the punishment." [Vol. ii. p. 34.]

"He who has accepted a loan, but has afterwards returned it, can deny that he received the loan, understanding *so as that he ought to pay it*. Salm. n. 140. et Sporer de 2. Præc. c. 1. n. 122. cum Suar. Nav. Az. Laym. Sanch. Cov. and others." [Ibid. 322.]

"He who comes from a place falsely supposed infectious, can deny that he came from that place, to wit, *as from a pestilent place*, because this is the mind of the *cordon sanitaire*. Salm. n. 141. Less. cap. 42. n. 47. Sanch. Dec. lib. 3. cap. 6. n. 35. et Sporer loc. sit. n. 140. cum Tol. Nav. Suar. Henr. Rod. etc."

"If any one invited to dine is asked if the food which is in fact unpalatable be good, he can answer, *It is good*, to wit, *for mortification*."

"It is asked, 5, Whether a servant, by the order of his master, can deny that he (the master) is at home. Card. diss. 19. n. 75. admits that he can feign his master's foot on the step, and answer, *He is not here*, because it is not mental restriction; but to this I do not assent, if the other can by no means understand that. Rather I would concede that he can say, *He is not here*, that is to say, *not in this door or window*, or (as Tourn. Mor. tom. 1. pag. 689) *He is not here so as that he may be seen*. Also Carden says that he can answer that *he has departed from*

ad mentem interrogantis, si adsit justa causa."

the house, by understanding a departure which took place in some time past; for we are not bound, he says, with Lessius, as above, to answer to the mind of him that interrogates, if there is a just cause." Ibid. 525.

Oaths are the *vincula* of our social system; which may be reformed, which may, as some say (though I doubt it), be done away with, but which, if perverted and vitiated, must lead to interminable mischief. What says the same of these:—

"Illud certum est quod, si ex eo quod jurasti, tantummodo parum aliquid non serves, non sit grave: v. gr. si jurasti te non bibiturum vinum, non peccas mortaliter parvum bibendo. Sach. t. 1. lib. 4. c. 32. n. 21. quia tunc excusat parvitas materiæ; et sic excusantur, qui jurant servare statuta alicujus capituli, collegii, universitatis, etc. si postea parvum aliquod statutum violent. Et idem dicimus de tabellionibus juratis et aliis ministris justitiæ; ut de eo qui ex summa quam alteri se daturum jurasset, parvum tantum detraheret. Navar. Suar. Sanch. Vide Laym. Bon. p. 13.

"It is certain that if you trangress only some small part of what you have sworn, it is not a grievous sin: for example, if you have sworn that you would not drink wine, you did not sin mortally in drinking a very little. Sanch. t. 1. lib. 4. c. 32. n. 21. because then the smallness of the matter excuses; and thus they are excused who swear to observe the statutes of some chapter, college, university, &c., if afterwards they violate the statutes in some small way. And we say the same concerning sworn public registrars and other ministers of justice; as also concerning him who, from the sum which he swore that he would give to another, should subtract only a little. Nava. Suar. Sanch. Vide Laym. Bon. p. 13.

"Obligaris probabiliter juramento promissario, etsi extortum a te sit per injuriam, ac metum: ut si oblitus uti equivocatione, jurasti prædonibus dare lytrum, usurario usuram."

"Probably you are obliged, by a promissory oath, although it may be extorted from you by injury and fear, as if, forgetting to use equivocation, you promised to robbers to give booty, or usury to usurers."

"Excipe tamen, si jurasses Titiæ eam ducere: nam eo casu potes, ea relicta, ingredi religionem; quia juramentum sortitur

"Nevertheless, make an exception if you have sworn to Titias to marry her; for in that case you can forsake her,

naturam actus, cui apponitur: promissioni autem matrimonii hæc tacita conditio inest, *nisi ingrediar religionem.* Vide Laym. c. 6. Bon. d. 4. q. 1. p. 3."

and enter a religious order: because the oath regards the nature of the act to which it pertains; but in the promise of matrimony there is this tacit condition, *unless I enter a religious order.*" See Laym. c. 6. Bon. d. 4. q. 1. p. 3. [Ibid. p. 337.]

Any gentleman who has made a vow to marry a lady, has only to turn monk to escape all the responsibility of that vow. If he goes into a convent, he has a "dispensation," according to the theology of Alphonsus Liguori, for his dishonesty and lying. Speaking of oaths, it is again said:—

"*Talia juramenta verius relaxione non indigent, quam de se sint nulla, juxta dicta n. 177. v. Aliter. Etsi tamen essent valida, ab ecclesia relaxari possunt. Salm. ibid. n. 6, cum Sanch. Pal. L. Guitier. Nomine autem Ecclesiæ veniunt non solum Pontifex, sed etiam episcopi, capituli sedibus vacantibus, et alii jurisdictionem episcopalem habentes, ut Salm. n. 7 et 8. et etiam confessarii.*"

"Such oaths truly do not need relaxation, since they are of themselves null and void, in accordance with what is said in n. 177. v. Aliter. However, let them be ever so valid, they can be relaxed by the Church. Salm. ibid. n. 6. cum Sanch. Pal et Guitier. But in the name of the Church are included not only the Pope, but also bishops, chapters, the episcopal seat being vacant, and others having episcopal jurisdiction, as Salm. n. 7 and 8, and also confessors."

"*Pontifex irritare potest omnia juramenta circa beneficia officia ecclesiastica.*"

"The Pontifex can render null and void all oaths respecting benefices and ecclesiastical offices."

On the fourth Commandment Liguori states—

"Sed urget magna oppositio, videlicet; præceptum Sabbati erat certe naturale et morale; nam ideo inter Decalogi præcepta numeratum fuit; ergo dominica quæ sabbato substituta fuit, etiam de jure naturali, sive divino est Respondetur, quod licet sit de jure divino et naturali, ut designetur aliquod tempus determina-

"But a great objection stands in the way, viz., the command of the Sabbath was certainly natural and moral, for on that account it was numbered amongst the precepts of the Decalogue; therefore the Lord's day, which was substituted for the Sabbath, is also either of natural or Divine right. It is answered, that al-

tum al Deum colendum, determinatio tamen hujus cultus, et dierum, quibus conferendus erat, fuerit a Christo dispositioni Ecclesiæ relicta; ita ut possit tunc Papa decernere ut observantia ut observantia dominicæ duraret tantum per aliquas horas, et quod licerent aliquo opera servilia, ut dicit Salm. dict. n. 38."

though it be of Divine and natural right, some determinate time should be allotted for the worship of God; however, the determination of that worship, and of the days in which it was to be offered up, have been left to the arrangement of the Church; so that the Pope can decree that the observance of the Lord's day should continue only for a few hours, and that certain servile works should be lawful, as Salm. dict. n. 38."

He says again—

"Unde, si filius sentiat se a Deo vocatum ad religiosum vel clericalem statum, et advertat parentes injuste impedituros, consultius aget rem iis celando, divinamque voluntatem exequendo."

"Hence, if a son thinks that he is called to a religious or clerical state, and supposes that his parents would unjustly impede him, he conducts the business more advisedly by concealing it from them, and by following the Divine will."

"Ex his omnibus concluditur, non solum, non peccare filios religionem assumentes, parentibus inconsultis: sed, ordinarie loquendo valde errare, si participes eos faciant de sua vocatione, ab periculum cui se exponunt, quod sint ab illa avertendi. Et hoc utique, confirmatur ab exemplo tot sanctorum, quorum discessus, parentibus insciis, aut invitis, Deus etiam miraculis approbavit, et benedixit. Idemque sentit doctus P. Elbel de Præcept. n. 538. dicens: Si filius sentiat se a Deo vocatum ad statum religiosum, et advertat parentes id ægre laturos atque ex affectu carnali ac futilibus motivis se opposituros, non tenetur iis consulere, quia consultius aget rem eis celando."

"From all these authorities we conclude that not only do children not sin, who enter a religious state without consulting their parents; but generally speaking, they err very much, on account of the danger to which they expose themselves of being averted from it, if they consult with them concerning their own call. And this, verily, is confirmed by the example of so many saints, whose departure, the parents being unconscious or unwilling, God approached and blessed even by miracles and the learned P. Elbel, de Præcept. n. 538, thinks the same thing, saying: 'If a son thinks that he is called to the religious state, and considers that the parents would bear it grievously, and that they would be opposed to it from a carnal affection and groundless motives, he is not

bound to consult them, because he conducts the matter more advisedly in concealing it from them.'"

On the subject of theft the following sentiments are taught:—

"Si quis ex occasione tatum furetur, sive uni, sive pluribus, modicum, non intendens notabile aliquid acquirere, nec proximo graviter nocere singulis furtis non peccat graviter, neque ea simul sumta unum mortale constituunt; postquam tamen ad quantitatem notabilem pervenerit, eam detinendo mortaliter peccare potest. Verum et hoc mortale evitabit, si vel tunc restituere non possit, vel animum habeat paulo post restituendi ea saltem quæ tunc accepit." [Vol. 3. p. 256.]

"If any one on an occasion should steal only a moderate sum either from one or more, not intending to acquire any notable sum, neither to injure his neighbour to a great extent; by several thefts, he does not sin grievously, nor do these, taken together, constitute a mortal sin; however, after it may have amounted to a notable sum, by detaining it he can commit mortal sin; but even this mortal sin may be avoided, if either then he be unable to restore, or have the intention of making restitution immediately of those things which he then received."

"Quer. II. Si furtula quæ simul ad magnam quantitatem perveniunt, sint facta diversis dominis certis an fur teneatur sub cúlpi gravi eis restitutionem facere; vel an satisfaciat debeta illa pauperibus distribuendo. Ex una parte, Videtur dicendum, sub gravi restitutionem faciendam esse dominis, nisi excuset periculum famæ amittendæ vel gravissimum damnum aut incommodum." [Vol. iii. p. 257.]

"Query II. If small thefts which together amount to a large sum, be made from various known masters, whether a thief be bound under great blame to make restitution to them, or whether he may satisfy by distributing them to paupers? On the one hand it appears that restitution should be made to the original possessors, unless the danger of losing fame, or very grievous loss, or inconvenience excuse."

"Unde videtur, quod sufficienter fur satisfaciet suæ gravi obligationi ex præsumpto consensu reipublicæ, si restituat pauperibus, aut locis piis, qui sunt egentiores reipublicæ partes." [Ibid. p. 258.]

"Whence it appears that a thief may have rendered sufficient satisfaction to his own weighty obligation from the presumed consent of the republic, if he make restitution to paupers, or pious places which are the more needy parts of the republic."

Speaking of the examination of parties suspected or accused of crimes, he says:—

"Denuo si reus fatetur delictum, proceditur ad sententiam: si non, proceditur ad eum convincendum, vel ad torturam." [Vol. v. p. 144.]

"Finally, if the accused confess his crime, the sentence is to be given: if not, he is to be led to conviction or the torture."

"Quia tortura instituta est ad subsidium probationis, quando argumenta, et indicia sunt valde efficacia, ut sic plena probatio eliciatur.' [Ibid. p. 146.]

"Because torture is a help to proof, when arguments and signs are very efficacious, that thus a full proof may be elicited."

"Sed dicendum omnes ad denuntiationem teneri ex eadem ratione ut supra, quia heresis est pestis ita noxia, quod difficile habet remedium, et facile in damnum vergit commune." [Ib. p. 184.]

"But all are bound to denounce for the same reason as above, because heresy is so noxious a pest that it may require a severe remedy, and very easily it may tend to the common loss."

These are but meagre extracts from a work which contains instructions in one volume so revolting, that their infamy is their only protection.

The portrait of the principal "successors of St. Peter," sketched by a favourite Cardinal of the Church of Rome, exhibits the effects and fruits of her moral teaching even in her very highest places, and in the public conduct of her infallible exponents. Baronius says: "Behold the nine hundredth year of our Redeemer begins, in which a new age commences, which, by reason of its asperity and barrenness of good, is wont to be called the iron age; and, by the deformity of its abounding evil, the leaden age; and, by its poverty of writers, the dark age; standing upon the threshold of which, we have thought it expedient, before we proceed further, on account of the crimes which it has been our lot to behold before the door, to make some preface by way of admonition to the reader, lest the weak-minded should take offence, if he sometimes perceives the abomination of desolation standing in the

temple, whereas he ought rather to wonder and to recognise the Divine power watching over its safety, since the desolation of the temple did not directly follow that abomination as was the case formerly, and should understand that it rests upon more solid foundations, namely, on the promises of Christ, which are stronger than heaven and earth, even as He himself testifies, saying: 'Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away.' But you will ask, What are these evils, and whence did these so great and most violent tempests arise? The case is such, that scarcely any one can believe or ever will believe it, except he sees it with his eyes, and handles it with his hands, viz., what unworthy, vile, unsightly, yea, what execrable and hateful things, the sacred Apostolic See, upon whose hinges the universal Apostolic Church turns, has been compelled to suffer, when the secular princes, although Christians, yet in this respect to be deemed most cruel tyrants, oppressively arrogated to themselves the election of the Roman Pontiffs! To our shame and grief be it spoken, how many *monsters*, horrible to behold, were intruded by them into that seat, which is reverenced by angels! How many evils originated from them, how many tragedies were perpetrated! With what filth it was her fate to be besprinkled who was without spot or wrinkle, with what stench to be infected, with what impurities to be defiled, and by these things to be blackened with perpetual infamy. . . . .

"Thus, indeed, at Rome, all things, as well sacred as profane, were mixed up with factions; so that the promotion to the Apostolic See was in the hands of that party which was in appearance the most powerful, so that at one time the Roman nobles, at another time the Prince of Tuscany, intruded by their secular power whatever Roman Pontiff they

wished, and cast out, whenever they could, him who was elevated by the contrary faction; which things were in agitation during almost the whole of this century, until the Othos, the emperors of Germany, who opposed both parties, interfered between them, arrogating to themselves equally the election of the Pope and the deposition of the elected. . . .

"When he (that is, Christopher) was again cast out, that wicked Sergius again, who, as you have heard, proceeded such lengths against Formosus, being powerful by the arms of Adalbert, Marquis of Tuscany, and being the slave of every vice, what did he leave unattempted? He invaded the seat of Christopher, not of Formosus, as Luitprand relates, through forgetfulness, who, it appears, indeed after a bad entry, and a worse course, attained a worse departure.

"These were most unhappy times, when each Pope, thus intruded, abolished the acts of his predecessor." 'Baronii Annales Ecclesiasticæ,' tom. x. A.D. 900. Stephani, P. vii. Antwerpiæ. 1603.

"For nearly one hundred and fifty years, from John VIII. to Leo. IX., about fifty Popes desisted wholly the virtues of their predecessors, being apostate rather that apostolical." Genebrandi Chron. Au. Ch. 204. Paris. 1585.

Dr. Newman says there is a practice of railing against the Jesuits. "It is vain to ask their slanderers what they know of them; did they ever see a Jesuit? can they say whether they are many or few? what do they" (the Protestants of England) "know of their teaching?" Since we seem to know very little of it, I have made a few extracts from the writings of the most celebrated of them; and I may add, that they are only flowers culled from a very large garden, containing others of a less aromatic description. Escobar, Emanuel Sa. Sanchez, Tam-

bourin, Lessius, and other very celebrated Jesuits, deserve our attention as expositors of ethics. I quote then, first from 'Escobar, Theol. Moral.' vol. i., book 8, problem 86:—"Query, if it be lawful to sell the obligation of administering the sacraments?" "Yes; if a man undertake to administer the sacraments with bodily pain and labour, which do accidentally accompany it, as to administer in a place far distant, and in such sort as gives him particular trouble." Then he may charge for the administration of the sacraments. Emanuel Sa says: "He who receives a sum of money for saying masses can engage others at a less sum, who may help him, while he retains the rest for himself." De Verbo Missæ, n. 45, p. 516.

I have quoted from Dr. Wiseman's great authority and saint, Liguori, the way of avoiding the question, "Is your master at home?" When it is put by a visitor to a servant, the servant is instructed in some Protestant—not true Protestant—families to say that his master is not at home. Dr. Wiseman's *protégé*, Saint Liguori, states that his servant may assert, "My master is not here;"—meaning in his own mind, "Not within the twelve inches of ground on which my feet stand." On looking over Suarez, as quoted by Filliutius (99 Mor. tom ii. tract 25, c. ii. n. 327), an eminent Jesuit writer, I found another explanation of it:—"If the servant be asked, 'Is the master at home?' he may say, '*Non est domi*,' which may appear to the mind of the interrogated to mean, 'He is not in the house;' but as '*est*' is the third person of the verb *edo*, to eat, he means that he does not *eat* at home." Such is a specimen of their moral teaching. Sanchez says: "A person having made a promise, and being called before a judge, may swear he did not make the promise, meaning that he did not make it so as to be obliged

to keep it." (Op. Moral, l. 3. c. 26, n. 32, p. 29.) Caramel says (Theol. Cund. p. 139): "A man hears the clock strike twelve on Saturday night. Rising from table, after having filled himself with meat, he hears another clock strike twelve also." A Roman Catholic must communicate fasting; so that in this case, since he could not receive the consecrated host after twelve o'clock the next day, he must not have eaten since twelve o'clock the night before:—"The following day being desirous to communicate, he reasons thus: Clocks are probable opinions. I have eaten before the last clock struck; it is therefore probable I ate before midnight on Saturday, and therefore that I am fasting on Sunday." Escobar says: "Excepting in the case of scandal, ecclesiastics sin not mortally in violating the laws of secular princes, because they are not directly bound by such laws." (Theol. Mor. vol. i. 5. s. 2. c. 19. prob. 19, p. 162.) Escobar says (Tract 6, Exam. 7. n. 132, p. 769): "I know it is not a great offence to get up a fable, if it be done with the intention of exciting the piety of the hearers; and also, to preach chiefly for personal glory, or even for money, I affirm, is not a mortal sin." Tambourine (b. 5. Dec. c. i. sec. 3, nn. 28, 30), says: "If you desire the death of your father, upon some conditions you may lawfully; that is, if I should say to myself, 'If my father should die I should enjoy his estate;' in this case I should not rejoice in my father's death, but in my inheritance. Again: I desire the death of my father, not because it is an evil to him, but the cause of good to me, and because by his death I enter on my inheritance." Lessius, quoting Amicus, another very celebrated Jesuit, says (p. 84, n. 41): "It is lawful for churchmen and monks to kill for the security of their lives; and they may use this liberty against their superiors, —a monk against an abbot, a son against a father, a

vassal against his prince." And Lessius adds: "If a priest be assailed while he is at the altar saying mass, he may defend himself, and even kill the assailant, if it be needful, and afterwards go on with the mass." Lessius says (De Justitia et Jure, lib. 2. dub. 12. n. 7): "If you endeavour to deprive me of my honour before a prince, or judge, or persons of quality, by accusing me of feigned crimes, as I have no other way to divert that loss of reputation than by killing you secretly, I may. The same is to be said if the crime be true, only it must be hid and secret." Amicus says (vol. i. Dispu. 36. sect. 4. p. 557): "The right of defending life belongs not only to one private person against another, but to a private against a public person—a subject, for instance, against a sovereign. The authors of whom I speak agree on this point, that to defend ourselves against an affront which might be given us, it is lawful to anticipate the aggressor by killing him. The clergy and religieux may defend their honour, and in doing so, do all that is necessary thereto; they may even kill him who would deprive them of it. It will be lawful for a priest or monk to kill a slanderer, who threatens to publish some great crimes against him or his order, if he have no other means to defend himself." These editions are in the Library of Sion College. Now, Dr. Newman's assertion is, that we never saw a Jesuit, that we know nothing of their teaching; and yet we say that "It is notorious that the Jesuits are a crafty, intriguing, unscrupulous, desperate, murderous, and exceedingly able body of men." I reply, the popular opinion is the true one; and I could quote a thousand extracts of the same spirit as those I have now quoted, to show that the Jesuits are all that popular belief says they are. Dr. Newman's tactics are transparent. He writes to annihilate a sound and healthy Protestant feeling,

in order to get on. And I think that Dr. Newman, when he characterises genuine charges as popular prejudices, and tries to turn them aside with a laugh, instead of directly and logically refuting them, does not much diminish the evidence that those quotations contain of what desperate tricks Jesuits are the patrons. The late Dr. Macbride, at a meeting of the Church Missionary Society at Oxford, stated: "The conduct of the Jesuits in Southern India we should have been slow to believe on less authority than their own; but, strange as it may seem, their published narratives show that they gloried in their shame, for they boasted that they deceived the Hindoos by representing themselves as a Brahminical caste from the north, assuming their peculiarities of diet and dress, even to the strings and other marks of idolatry, and actually forging a document in the native tongue to prove this falsehood. Such was their appearance; and if we inquire after their doctrine, we are told that they allowed their converts to bow to their former idols, mentally transferring their worship to the crucifix hid within their clothes; and in countries where to adore a crucified god would be deemed insanity, they suppressed the scandal of the cross; preaching not a suffering, but a glorified Messiah. Robert di Nobili, founder of the Madura mission, by besmearing his countenance with heathen marks, and imitating the painful method of living of the Hindoo devotees, at length persuaded the natives that he was himself a Brahmin from the north, and thus gained over twelve eminent members of that high caste, whose example and influence led to many conversions. Father Jouvenei, historian of the order, tells us that, when the authenticity of his parchment was called in question, he declared upon oath that he sprang from the god Brahma, and mentions it as redounding to

his credit. Justice to the memory of Pope Benedict XIV. requires me to add, that he solemnly condemned all fraudulent methods of conversion. The testimony of Paschal might be regarded as suspicious; but he fortifies it by an appeal to the decree of the Propaganda; and so little are in our times Roman Catholic converts trained to respect truth, that the Abbé Dubois informs us that, having in a sermon described our Lord as the reputed son of a carpenter, and his apostles as fishermen, his congregation begged that if he had occasion to allude to their birth, he would describe them as of the noble military caste. See Abbé Dubois' 'Letters on the State of Christianity in India,' in which the conversion of Hindoos is considered as impracticable; London, 1823. He confesses that in a degree he acted upon their views; for, knowing that the Hindoos regarded any use of intoxicating liquors as sinful, he was cautious, in speaking of the elements of the Eucharist, to call the wine by a periphrasis more palatable to their taste." The popular idea of the Jesuits is the true one; they are "a crafty, intriguing, unscrupulous, desperate, murderous, and exceedingly able body of men; a secret society ever plotting against liberty, and government, and progress."

But of all the springs of immorality in the practical working of the Church of Rome, the most fertile is the Confessional.

The infallible Lateran Council decrees: "Let every one, both men and women, truly make confession of all their sins *at least* once a year to their own priests, or to some other, having permission first from their own priests, else he can neither absolve or bind them."

The Council of Trent says: "The Universal Church has always understood, that an *entire confession* of sins was ordained by Christ, and that it is

of Divine right, necessary to be observed by all who have fallen into sin after baptism, for our Lord Jesus Christ being taken from earth to heaven, left His priests as His vicars, to be judges and presidents, before whom all the faithful should bring *all* the mortal sins into which they have fallen, to the end that using the power of the keys committed to them, for the remission or retaining of sins, they pronounce sentence; as it is manifest that the priests *could not exercise this jurisdiction, without knowledge of the causes of sin,* nor maintain equity in the infliction of penances, if penitents should confess their sins only in general and not in detail, it follows, that they ought to disclose and enumerate *all the mortal sins* with which they are conscious that they are chargeable, even the *most secret* of their transgressions; and not only the sins themselves, but ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES which give a particular complexion to them."

The celebrated canonized Saint, Liguori, the great master of morals according to Cardinal Wiseman, whose writings four successive Popes and the Sacred Congregation pronounced faultless, indulges in a series of the most gross and revolting questions to be addressed by a priest in the confession box to married and unmarried women—so revolting that their intense indecency is their protection. The moral effects of such an Institution must be dreadful. The priest addresses his penitent thus: "Brother, do you wish to recover from this wickedness? Is it not so? And since you are prepared to do this, be of a cheerful spirit; *therefore narrate your remaining sins, concealing nothing.* Beware, I beseech you, lest you commit sacrilege, for this is the greatest of all sins which you have hitherto committed. *Therefore tell everything* with a cheerful spirit; conquer yourself; confess *all things* sincerely, for God is ready to spare thee."—Ibid. No. 4.

Liguori exhorts that the confessor, as a father, must be bland in his manners.

Secondly, he is a Physician: "therefore he should know the origin and cause of all spiritual diseases."

Some confessors inquire only the number and the species of sin; but says our saint—

"Good confessors act otherwise; for they, in the first place, begin to investigate the cause and seriousness of the disease BY INTERROGATING CONCERNING THE HABIT OF SINNING—THE OCCASION—THE TIME—THE PLACE—THE PERSONS WITH WHOM—THE COMBINATION OF CIRCUMSTANCES."—Ibid. No. 6.

"In the first place, the priest ought to know the state of the penitent's conscience, after that observe his disposition; and then either grant or withhold absolution."—Ibid. No. 19.

The following instructions are given as to the interrogations which are to be made by the confessor:—

"As to the sixth command, penitents are to be interrogated concerning thoughts, whether they may have desired or dwelt with delight on ill-favoured subjects, and whether they have given their consideration or consented to these things; then * * * * * * * * * * * *

"As to the sins of married persons, with regard to them, GENERALLY SPEAKING THE CONFESSOR IS BOUND, AND OUGHT ONLY TO INTERROGATE THE WIVES."

On these and kindred themes this great authority dwells with much freedom of language. Fortunately it is in Latin, and none, therefore, of the female sex either can, or if they knew would attempt to understand what he writes. No man can be pure who is daily discussing such themes with penitents, and no woman can remain undefiled who submits to such examinations.

That the confessional has led to gross immorality we learn from the statements of St. Liguori, who writes an appendix concerning those confessors who solicit their penitents to immoral acts. The heading of the chapter will reveal a glimpse of the matter of which it treats.

"676.—*Concerning the clause* 1 *of seduction, in the act of sacramental confession.* 677.—*Clause II., either before or immediately after.* 678.—*Clause III. From the occasion or pretext of confession—what the occasion of confession means. Dub. I. whether he is to be denounced who solicits a woman asking that he may hear her to-morrow. Dub. II. whether he is to be denounced who, having heard the weakness of a woman, solicits her afterwards at home.* 679.—*What the pretext of confession means, and what, if according to agreement, the woman pretending illness send for the confessor to commit sin with her.* 680.—*On the clause in the confessional box or some other place, pretending to hear confession there; what feigning means; and what, if the confessor solicit in the confessional box, without however the pretence of confession.*" *Liber VI.*

Liguori largely treats all these questions. It will be at once seen that such things *have been* and are likely to be done.

He asks—

"*Whether the confessor is to be denounced who praises a woman for her beauty?*"

Some answer in the affirmative, others in the negative; but Liguori accords with the opinion of Escobar, as follows:—

"*But more justly the above-mentioned Escobar, num.* 640, *distinguishes the matter, saying that if from the manner of speaking or other circumstances, the confessor is known to praise her beauty with a depraved intention; then he should be denounced—but he should*

not be denounced, if he praise her merely from imprudence or levity of mind."

Again :—

"*If he say to a woman, 'Remember me, because I love thee from the heart,'* some doctors think he should be denounced.

"But Bardonus *excuses* him: 'This more justly, I think, is to be determined according to circumstances.'"

The immoral acts of the confessional are fully admitted by Saint Liguori :—

"119.—IV. Summe cautus debet esse confessarius in excipiendis confessionibus mulierum. Et primo notandum, quod in decreto S. C. episcoporum 21. Januarii 1610, dicatur; Confessarii sine necessitate audire non debent mulierum confessiones post crepusculum respertinum et ante auroram. Loquendo autem de prudentia confessarii, ipse regulariter in confessionali cum junioribus sit potius rigidus, quam suavis; nec permittat illas ante confessionale accedere, ut ei loquantur, et multo minus ut manus deosculentur. In actu confessionis non ostendat se eas agnoscere; aliquæ enim, quæ religiosæ haberi volunt, aliquando advertentes se nosci a confessario, non faciunt integram confessionem. Imprudentia quoque est oculos conjicere in pœnitentes, cum e confessionali recedunt, easque per aliquod tempus intueri. Extra confessionale nec etiam immoretur colloquendo cum ipsis in ecclesia, omnemque familiaritatem devitet. Abstineat etiam a recipiendis munusculis; et præcipue illarum domos nunquam accedat, unc excepto casu gravis

"A confessor ought to be exceedingly cautious in receiving the confessions of women; and in the first place is to be noted, what is said in the decree of the Sacred Congregation of Bishops, on the 21st January, 1610. Confessors without necessity ought not to hear the confessions of women after evening twilight, or before morning. But in speaking concerning the prudence of the confessor, he should generally in confession be rather rigid with his juniors than pleasant, nor should he allow them to come to him before confession to speak to him, and much less to kiss his hands. In the act of confession he ought not to appear to know them, for some females who wish to be thought religious, when they perceive that they are known by the confessor, do not make a complete confession;—also, it is imprudent to fix the eyes on the penitents when they depart from the confessional, to gaze upon them for some time. Out of the confessional also he should not continue speaking with them in the church, and he should avoid all familiarity. Also, let him

infirmitatis, et tunc non nisi vocatus accedat; et tunc magnam adhibeat diligentiam in audiendis illarum confessionibus; unde januam apertam relinquat, sedeat in loco ubi videri possit ab aliis, oculosque in faciem pœnitentis nunquam defigat. Et hoc præsertim currit, si sint personæ spirituales, quibuscum est periculum majoris adhesionis. Dicebat ven. P. Sertorius Capotus diabolum ad conjungendas inter se personas spirituales ab initio uti prætextu virtutis, ut deinde affectus a virtute transeat ad personam; unde ait S. Augustinus apud S. Thomam (Opusculo 64 de Famil. Dom. etc.): Sermo brevis, et rigidus cum his mulieribus habendus est; nec tamen quia sanctiores, ideo minus cavendæ; quo enim sanctiores fuerint, eo magis allitrant. Et idem angelicus doctor addit: Licet carnalis affectio sit omnibus periculosa, ipsis tamen magis perniciosa, quando conversantur cum persona quæ spiritualis videtur; nam, quamvis principium videatur purum, frequens tamen familiaritas domesticum est periculum: quæ quidem familiaritas quanto plus crescit, infirmatur principale motivum et puritas maculatur. Et subjungit quod tales personæ hoc non statim advertant, quoniam diabolus ab initio non immittit sagittas venenatas, sed illas tantummodo, quæ aliquantulum feriunt, et augent affectum. Sed brevi hujusmodi personæ eo deveniunt ut non amplius agant secum tanquam angeli, quemadmodum cœperant, sed tanquam carne vestiti; vicissim se intuentur mentesque sibi feriunt blandis allocutionibus, quæ adhuc a prima devotione videntur pro-

abstain from receiving gifts, and especially let him never approach their homes, except in the case of great sickness, and then not unless he be called for, in which case he ought to take great care in hearing their confessions; wherefore, let him leave the door open.—let him sit in a place where he may be seen by others, —and let him never fix his eyes on the penitent; and this especially ought to be attended to, if they be spiritual persons with whom there is a greater danger of attraction. The venerable P. Sartorius Capotus says that the devil, in order to unite spiritual persons together, from the beginning made use of the pretext of virtue, that thence the passion may pass from the virtue to the person; hence says St. Augustine, according to St. Thomas (Opuscolo 64 de Famil. Dom. etc.) The discourse with these women should be strict and brief, neither are they to be the less guarded against, because the more holy they are, the more attractive;' and the same angelic doctor adds: 'Although carnal affections be dangerous in all, however, it is more so to themselves when they converse with a person who appears spiritual; for although the beginning may appear pure, however, a frequent familiarity renders danger familiar, which familiarity indeed, in proportion as it increases, the principal motive is weakened, and purity is spotted.' And he adds, that 'such persons do not immediately perceive this, since the devil does not always throw poisoned arrows, but only those which strike but lightly and increase the affection. *But in a*

cedere: hiuc alter alterius præsentiam incipit appetere; sicque (concludit) spiritualis devotio convertitur in carnalem. Et quidem, oh quot sacerdotes, qui antea erant innocentes, ob similes adhæsiones quæ spiritu cœperant, Deum simul et spiritum perdiderunt! Advertatur hic, quod ex decreto S. C. epis. sub. 21. jan. 1620. confessarii sine necessitate audire non debeant mulierum confessiones post crepusculum vespertinum, et ante auroram.

"120.—Deinde confessarius non adeo mulierum confessionibus sit addictus, ut per hoc homines ad se venientes audire recuset. Oh! qualis miseria est cernere tot confessarios, qui impendunt bonam diei partem in audiendis religiosis aliquibus mulierculis, quas vulgo dicunt bizocas; et cum postea vident ad se accedere homines aut feminas uxoratas qui sunt pleni angustiis, et molestiis, et qui ægre domos, et negotia sua relinquere potuerunt, dimittunt eos, dicendo: *Habeo aliud quod agam, ite ad alios;* unde fit ut isti, non invenientes cui sua peccata confiteantur, vivant per tot menses et annos sine sacramentis, et sine Deo."

short time such persons come to this, that they no longer act towards each other as angels, as they commenced, but as those who are clothed in flesh; they interchange looks and their minds are affected by soft expressions, which still seem to proceed from the first devotion; hence the one begins to long for the presence of the other, and thus (he concludes) the spiritual devotion is converted into carnal.' AND INDEED, OH HOW MANY PRIESTS WHO BEFORE WERE INNOCENT, ON ACCOUNT OF SIMILAR ATTRACTIONS, WHICH BEGAN IN THE SPIRIT, HAVE LOST BOTH GOD AND THEIR SOUL. Here is to be observed what is prescribed according to the decree of the sacred congregation, that confessors, unnecessarily, ought not to hear the confessions of women after evening twilight, or before morning.

"120.—Moreover, the confessor ought not to be so addicted to the confessions of women, that on this account he would refuse to hear the confessions of men who come to him. OH WHAT MISERY IT IS TO OBSERVE SO MANY CONFESSORS, WHO SPEND A LARGE PORTION OF THE DAY IN HEARING THE CONFESSIONS OF CERTAIN RELIGIOUS WOMEN, WHO ARE COMMONLY CALLED, BIZOCAS, and when they afterwards observe men or married women coming to them, who are filled with cares and grievances, and who can scarcely leave their homes and businesses, dismiss them, saying, 'I have something else to do, go to some one else,'—whence it happens, that they not coming to confess their sins, live, through whole months and years, without the Sacraments and without God."

Again he says:—

"193.—XXI. In audiendis confessionibus mulierum, illisque pertractandis, adhibeat eam austeritatem quæ conveniens est secundum prudentiam; et ideo recuset munuscula, effugiat familiaritatem, et omnia alia quæ possunt esse causa adhesionis. Oh, aliquam circa hoc negligentiam, oh, quot confessarii et suas, et pœnitentium animas perdiderunt."

"In hearing the confessions of women, and in discoursing with them, he ought to use that austerity which is in accordance with prudence, and moreover refuse gifts, avoid familiarity and all those other things which can be the cause of adhesion. Oh, how many confessors have lost their own souls and those of their penitents, on account of some negligence in this respect"!!! No. 193.

A few testimonies gathered from reliable witnesses will show that national as well as individual degeneration follows the domination of Romanism. It shortens the Decalogue and lengthens the Creed. It convulses kingdoms and corrupts homes. It is demoralizing in proportion to its influence, and idolatrous—demonstrably idolatrous—in its worship.

Lord Macaulay remarks: "During the generation which preceded the Reformation, that court had been a scandal to the Christian name. Its annals are black with treason, murder, and incest. Even its more respectable members were utterly unfit to be ministers of religion. They were men like Leo X.; men who, with the Latinity of the Augustan age, had acquired its atheistical and scoffing spirit. They regarded these Christian mysteries, of which they were stewards, just as the Augur Cicero and the Pontifex Maximus Cæsar regarded the Sybilline books, and the pecking of the sacred chickens. Among themselves, they spoke of the Incarnation, the Eucharist, and the Trinity, in the same tone in which Cotta and Vellenis talked of the Oracle of Delphi, or of the voice of Faunus in the mountains. Their years glided by in a short dream of sensual and intellectual voluptuousness. Choice cookery, delicious wines, lovely women, —

hounds, falcons, horses, newly-discovered manuscripts of the classics, sonnets, and burlesque romances in the sweetest Tuscan, just as licentious as a fine sense of the graceful would permit; plates from the hand of a Benvenuto; designs for palaces by Michael Angelo; frescoes by Raphael; busts, mosaics, and gems, just dug up from among the ruins of ancient temples and villas,—these things were the delight and even the serious business of their lives."

In the words of Sismondi: "All effort of the human mind was considered an attack against the government; all liberty of writing or printing was forbidden; all public discussion was interdicted. Nothing obtained respect but the vilest abuses; civil liberty was openly violated; men suspected, not of guilty actions, but of liberal opinions, were exposed to the most painful death, not as punishment, but torture. The convents themselves had their paid assassins. The state of the Church during the whole of this century might be compared to a great desert, which no spark of life was suffered to cheer or animate."

Quinet, describing the same era, observes: "The Inquisition had stifled every semblance of life or motion in Italy. Mathematics were condemned, physical science interdicted, geometry excommunicated; that it might be proved to the world, that if Italy is arrested in her progress towards perfection—if she ceases to produce—it is because every outlet is closed, and life itself condemned to perish for want of renovating care."

It would be an offence to all delicacy to describe the revolting immorality of Pope Alexander VI., who died by the poison he had prepared for another; or the incest and atrocious sensuality of Borgia, who, a celibate by the laws of his Church, created his sons Cardinals, and impoverished the Church to enrich them.

Such was Italy; such Rome is still. She has from that day to this steadily repelled the tide of the Reformation from her shores; and with sleepless watchfulness, and unsparing cruelty, she has exterminated every free thought she could detect, and quenched all that we are proud of, in the blood of her noblest men. She has remained, in faith, exactly what she was in 1517. Has she risen in *intellectual* or *moral* greatness? What are the fruits of Romanism on its own soil, sacredly preserved from the weeds of Protestantism, presided over by the Vicar of Christ, with a priest for every seventy persons, and a church for every day of the year? Has this consecrated soil been a garden of Eden? Her offices of state are occupied by cardinals and bishops; priests are her financiers, and the dogmas and domination of the Papacy impregnate the air, and shape the policy of her administration. Hers has been a splendid opportunity,—an undisputed choice of her men and measures. If she has failed, the solution of her failure must be in her creed; it cannot be anywhere else.

Let us hear impartial witnesses. Quinet says: "Popery, false to its promise, sits down unrepentant amidst the universal death which extends from Calabria to the Alps. Clandestine marriages meet with no opposition,—permission to marry is given with as much facility as a passport, and with this passport, the priest of the parish gives the nuptial benediction. In the higher classes of society ignorance and idleness are as general as at Venice. The young men who read confine their studies to the lighter poems of Voltaire."

Lady Morgan writes: "The avenues which lead to St. John de Lateran have no parallel in the history of desolation. St. Paul's and St. John's rise on the dreary frontiers of the infected deserts they dominate,

like temples dedicated to the genius of malaria. The Cardinals govern by cabal, and all places are disposed of through their mistresses. The people, without domestic habits, live like the commoners of nature, satisfied if bread and church ceremonies sustain nature, and amuse it. The women of all ranks are divided into vestals and concubines, shut up in a convent, or let loose upon society, free from the duties of maternity and the ties of marriage. Assassination was a deed of nightly occurrence." Writing from Genoa, Lady Morgan says: "I never, in my life, was so dismayed. The wonderful novelty of everything; the unusual smells; the unaccountable filth, though it is reckoned the cleanest of Italian towns. The passages were squalid, and more close than any in St. Giles's or old Paris, in some of which not vagabonds, but well-dressed women, with white veils and great fans, were passing and repassing. Its disheartening dirt, discomfort, and decay perfectly confounded me."

Writing of Naples, she says: "What is to be said of a government which reduces the great majority of the people to a slavish insensibility to national degradation, to a perfect indifference to national honour—which renders the subject too ignorant to comprehend the causes of his sufferings, and too listless to seek their removal? Saint Golagara, the patron of Calabria, had seldom his due complement of limbs and features; but when a good harvest brought him into favour, his pardon was asked, his nose glued on, his face fresh painted, and his sanctity replaced in all its honours."

The Abbé de Lamennais writes: "One sees everywhere in Italy some grievous spectacle, some mark of bondage. The universal misery revealing itself under so many hideous forms, contrasts in most places with the native richness of the soil. Even religion seems to have done nothing during ten centuries but build

itself a vast sepulchre. There seems to arise from Rome some indescribable vapour of the tomb, which lulls to rest and sleep, soothing the soul to dreams of eternal slumber. We may live there with the hope of death, but never with that of life, for there exists not in the place a shadow of vitality—no movement save that secret agitation caused by the hidden multitude of small interests, which crawl and creep in darkness like the worms amid the gloom of the sepulchre. Power and people all appear like shadows of the past. The queen of cities, throned in the midst of a wilderness, has become the city of Death, who reigns triumphant in all his majesty."

Another writes (Briffault): "In Rome, among other places of Italy, it is common to pray to Mary to favour all the bad desires engendered by the worst of passions. Does not the brigand place beneath the invocation of the Virgin his deeds of murder and rapine? Does not the courtesan believe her duty done when she has veiled the image of the Madonna which decks her boudoir? Does not the rosary hang at the assassin's girdle side by side with the dagger and stiletto? Does not the bandit's peaked hat display a goodly show of blessed images? Does not the scapulary cover the breast where crime is engendered? No one would dare to ask of a man what the Roman dares to beg of 'the Holy Mother of God.' What has the Church done to stay such shameless deviations? Has she not, on the contrary, by her complacency authorised these superstitious beliefs which submit to her dominion the multitude thus weakened and degraded?"

In the words of Sismondi: "The Italians are nourished from infancy to old age with the poison of corruption. A profound pity for the fate of this nation, so cruelly debased by man, so richly endowed by nature, must be the result of this examination."

Italy is the land of beauty; air, earth, water, and light are seemingly purer and brighter than elsewhere. Its fertility, its historic renown, its traditions, its central situation, are all fitted to raise its people to a pitch of power and prosperity unrivalled by any existing country; yet it is the land of decay, of indolence, and death. Its breed of beggars, ecclesiastical and secular, is almost incredible. Dr. Baird says: "What is absolutely confounding is the fact that in proportion as you approach the city of Rome, come from what end of Italy you may, bad government, physical desolation, ignorance, irreligion, vice, and crime, all increase. When you reach Rome, you will find less of true piety and purity of morals than in any other city in Christendom; yet this city is the abode of the so-styled Vicar of Christ."

There are in the city of Rome 54 parishes, 27,500 families, 39 bishops, 1,514 priests, 2,471 monks, 1,754 nuns. Naples, with a population of 6,000,000, has 100,000 priests and ecclesiastics. These ecclesiastics lead lives of indolence; the mass of the people is poverty stricken, and the money of the nation is in the hands of a few bankers and wealthy men. The Campagna and the Pontine Marshes remain the hotbeds of disease and poisonous malaria. Were they in the possession of our country, they would be turned into fertile fields and gardens.

The priests are hated by the people; the people are suspected by the priests.

Sismondi says: "No kind of industry can be pursued without capital. Agriculture requires land, commerce exacts capital, and the manufacturer cannot pursue his calling without tools and raw material. The greater proportion of younger sons, excluded in Italy from every one of these pursuits on account of their poverty, live in constant dependence and idleness. Four-fifths of the nation are condemned to no

interest in life, no hope in the future, and to contribute by no exertion to the prosperity of their fellow-countrymen.'

Lady Morgan says: "Nothing is done to promote commerce within, and everything is done to cripple it without."

Malte Brun observes: "The universal taste for the *farniente* is not wholly to be attributed to the influence of climate. It is to a moral, rather than to a physical cause that we must have recourse to account for the change in the mass of a people which has preserved no vestige of the activity and power of its ancestors. Who has not remarked the annoyance with which the beggar demands the price of his importunity? He thinks his destitution gives him a right to the charity he implores. This idea leads to another, that beggary is a trade, a kind of lawful occupation; shame has no longer access to his soul; and if begging procures him a subsistence, he prefers it to work. We cannot be astonished that where mendicity has become a profession, highway robbery is also followed as a profitable trade. Those great plague-spots of Italy, brigandage and beggary, are spread over the kingdom of Naples as well as the Papal States. Every man carries a carabine, and hangs round his neck the image of the Virgin or of the Holy Child."

Briffault says: "The Church encourages idleness. The money which could be employed by the poor in procuring comfortable clothing is absorbed by offerings and devotional exactions. Thus, in that pious city, so full of the ministers of religion, we find an entire population driven by fever and consumption to the hospitals. This abject race mix up with their trade of beggary, rapine, espionage, and intrigue. At the very gates of Rome the country is infested by armed brigands. Of all Italian countries, the Papal States remain the most infested by brigands."

Sicily, with a population of 1,500,000, has 28,000 monks, and 10,000 nuns: *i.e.* an idle, lazy monk for every 35 inhabitants.

M. Cambray exclaims: "Unhappy people of Italy, to what an abject state of slavery has thy superstition led thee! You have succeeded in dishonouring the richest country in the world; and if population and liberty do not penetrate among you, we shall one day see Tuscany deserted, and Rome without inhabitants.

Lady Morgan says, in conclusion: "Let the traveller in Rome examine the vortex of European wealth sunk into abject poverty; let him remark the silent desolation of the streets, the poisonous solitude of the environs, the faded splendour of the palaces, the accumulating ruins of mean edifices, the total absence of commerce, the hopeless struggle of lingering industry; let him watch the melancholy dejectedness of the lower classes, the complacent look of the prelates, the hypocritical but cunning obsequiousness of the priests, the more timid and servile humiliation of the laymen, the destitution of the multitudinous mendicants, the freezing discontent of the nobles, beggared by the mismanagement of the overgrown populace; in short, let him extend his glance through every rank of society, from the Pope to the mendicant friar, from the senator of Rome to the lay beggar, and let him ask himself in which of the classes of the Roman citizens he would willingly and preferably enrol himself."

Sismondi (vol. xvi. p. 408): "Would you entrust your honour, your fortune, to those mendicant monks, or those Jesuit priests; even to those cardinals seated at the theatre with dissolute women? Who is to be accused of these evils? Is it the country itself, the soil, the climate? No; in that unhappy land everything from the hand of the Almighty is bright, and

brilliant—everything beneath the control of man wretched and miserable. Are we bound to accuse the present race of Italians? History protests against the accusation. The name of Roman awakens two distinct ideas, whether we apply it to the days of ancient or modern Rome—the man of nature still Pagan, or the man of civilisation perverted by Romanism."

Niebuhr says: "The Italians, as a nation, are walking dead men. Intellect and knowledge, any idea which makes the heart throb—all generous activity is banished from the land; all hope, all aspiration, all effort,—even all cheerfulness, for I have never seen a more cheerless nation."

A recent French writer, M. Menche de Loisne, in a work entitled 'France et Angleterre,' says, justly: "Each revolution in France has shaken the very foundations of society, and menaced its existence. Each revolution in England has, on the contrary, strengthened and fortified the social constitution of the country. Why? Because our revolutions have all been inspired by men who, for the greater part, *had no religious feeling;* while revolutions in England were the work of those who possessed faith and the solid principles of religion."

Lord Macaulay, the eloquent historian, thus writes of the Church of Rome: "To stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom, whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life, has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual torpor; while Protestant countries, once proverbial for sterility and barbarism, have been turned, by skill and industry, into gardens,

and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers and poets. Whoever, knowing what Italy and Scotland naturally are, and what, four hundred years ago, they actually were, shall now compare the country round Rome with the country round Edinburgh, will be able to form some judgment as to the tendency of Papal domination. The descent of Spain, once the first among monarchies, to the lowest depths of degradation; the elevation of Holland, in spite of many natural disadvantages, to a position such as no commonwealth so small has ever reached, teach the same lesson. Whoever passes, in Germany, from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant principality, in Switzerland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant canton, in Ireland from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant county, finds that he has passed from a lower to a higher grade of civilisation. On the other side of the Atlantic the same law prevails. The Protestants of the United States have left far behind them the Roman Catholics of Mexico, Peru, and Brazil. The Roman Catholics of Lower Canada remain inert; while the whole continent round them is in a ferment with Protestant activity and enterprise."

The state of Italy was thus described by the correspondent of the 'Times' a few years ago: "Thievish, bigoted, beggarly, beautiful Naples begins to restore to Rome the foreigners who, preferring the possibility of earthquake to the probability of fever, fled in summer to the orange shades of Sorrento, the picturesque rocks of Capri, and the many charming nooks that indent the shores of the loveliest of European bays. Naples has certainly of late lost favour with the English in Italy. As a pleasant residence it ill supports comparison with Rome, which is comparatively a clean, comfortable, commodious, civilised city. People get tired of having their

blood sucked by innumerable vermin, and their olfactories offended by continual stench; they object to being mobbed by mendicants as often as they cross their threshold; and they do not much relish the groans which issue, in spite of all precautions, from Ferdinand's numerous and well-guarded gaols. They prefer a capital where, in externals at least, the decencies are observed. And, moreover, Rome, although in Italy, can hardly be considered as an Italian city. It is garrisoned by the French and occupied by the English. Gallic steel maintains order, and British gold preserves prosperity.' As I write, the hardy little troopers of the Empire tramp past the street-end to the sound of their clean-blown trumpets, and an old organ woman is grinding 'God save the Queen,' below the window. There are Roman troops here, certainly; fine-looking dragoons, of the sort one sees in French engravings mercilessly pistolling picturesque brigands, and rescuing fair-haired daughters of Albion tied to trees in hysterics. Infantry there also are, of no very martial or cleanly aspect, and Swiss in French uniforms, and Papal Body Guards in black and yellow stockings and harlequin jackets conformable, something between Rigoletto and a beefeater, who stand cloaked and stately at the Vatican's door, and help the porter to take care of the umbrellas and sticks. But these are merely to make up a show. See, on St. Peter's Piazza, the men of action, the true masters of the situation, in their grey coats and red trousers, smart, active, and soldierly. There exist persons, worthy of credit, who assert that some parts of Rome are still inhabited by Romans. It may be so, but little is known of those remote quarters. The crown of the causeway, the pick of the street, is for John Bull, to whom has adjoined himself, in some force, his brother Jonathan. English is spoken in the hotels, English inscriptions

are on the shops, English goods within them: it is an even bet, that every third well-dressed man or woman you meet on the Corso is English, as are, certainly, nine out of ten of those hardworking persons who industriously perambulate ruins, galleries, and studios, counting statues and 'doing' Rome. On the Pincian Hill a French band plays to an English audience; and if now and then a Cardinal drives by, his scarlet gown looks like an intrusion among the crowd of British paletôts. We are told of a Pope, but we believe in a General, and the priestly frock gives the wall to the soldier's tunic."

What a contrast in all these relations is Protestant Christianity, impartial Romanists being judges. The most reflecting and best-read writers attest its civilising and ennobling influence.

Thomas Cromwell, the friend of Wolsey, who was allowed an interview with the King on the subject of his divorce, well expressed the truth in these words: "Every Englishman is master in his own house; and why should not you be so in England? Ought a foreign prelate to share your power? The bishops make oath to your Majesty, but they make another to the Pope immediately after, which absolves them from the former. Sire, you are half a king, and we half your subjects. This kingdom is a two-headed monster; will you bear with such an anomaly any longer? Henceforth let Englishmen alone have anything to say in England. Let not your subjects' money be cast into the yawning gulf of the Tiber. Convert to the general good those treasures which have only served to fatten proud priests and lazy friars."

A foreign writer (Simon. vol. i. p. 256), describing the fourteenth century, says: "Levity of conduct, and even greatest indecency, occurred in the churches. The sanctuary was transformed into a

place of gossiping and amusement; the men came there with their hounds, and falcons on their wrists, to talk of their affairs."

M. Guizot observes: "The sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have produced admirable results in England. There is no country perhaps in which the principles of religion have possessed, and still exercise, greater power than in England." M. Leon Faucher: "Let any one examine what England has gained in a century and a half in population, wealth, and territory, and declare whether, in the history of the world, there is an example of such aggrandisement. England now claims a preponderating influence in Europe, and an exclusive dominion in the rest of the world."

Another foreigner expatiates on the streets, the shops, the parks, the equipages of London, as altogether unparalleled, and as evidences of vast wealth.

Faucher observes: "That he found invariably the filth, and immorality, and poverty of London, centering in Irish Roman Catholic districts. In one district where they swarm, he notices an exceptional cluster—the silk-weavers of Spitalfields; and these," he says justly, "are the Protestant French, who, at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, carried with them into England their religion, and at this day are witnesses of its practical and social worth."

"Home," says another Frenchman, "is the centre of the entire existence of the English: it is the stronghold of their fortune, their family, and their liberty."

"Nowhere," says Madame de Staël, "do wives share, with so much courage and simplicity, the troubles and dangers of their husbands." Another says: "If the attachment of the wife is more durable, the reason is that the husbands are more faithful.

The English women are grave and serious, their hands are less occupied with amusements than with their husbands' other domestic cares."

What an exquisite gem dropped from the pen of one of England's gifted spirits, when he wrote: "It is a fine show, a golden sight, to see the crowning of a king. I have beheld the ceremony, with undazzled eyes, have well considered all its blaze of splendour. A tender thing to think of is the kiss of peace; beautiful the homage; heartstirring the voice of the champion, when the brave knight dashes his defying gauntlet on the marble stone; very solemn the anointing, and most uplifting the song of jubilate when all is done. But, sir, to my coarse apprehension, I have seen a nobler sight than this, a grander ceremony, even at the hearthstone of the poor. I will show you a man, worn, spent, the bony outline of a human thing, with toil and want cut, as with an iron tool, upon him; a man to whom the common pleasures of this our mortal heritage are unknown as the joys of Paradise. This man toils and starves, and starves and toils, even as the markets vary. Well, he keeps a heart, sound as oak, in his bosom. In the sanctity of his soul, he bestows the kiss of peace upon a grudging world; he compels the homage of respect, and champions himself against the hardness of fortune. In his wretched homestead he is throned in the majesty of the affections. His suffering, patient, loving wife, his pale-faced, ill-clad children, are his queen and subjects. He is a king in heart, subduing and ruling the iron hours; unseen spirits of love and goodness anoint him; and as surely as the kingdom of God is more than a fairy tale, so surely do God's angels sing that poor man's jubilate."

Study our domestic comforts, our social intercourse, our national freedom, the respect truly

yielded where respect is due, and obedience to law accepted less as a necessity than a sacred duty. See loyalty inspired by love, and sovereignty melted into sympathy and sisterhood, the whole nation standing up to protect the lowliest member, and the very humblest of the industrious poor feeling neither forgotten nor forsaken. The nations of Europe cannot move without consulting us, and one word thrown into the scale weighs heavier far than the ancient heathen's sword; our ships are beating white the waters of every ocean, and their pennons float on every wind of heaven, and their anchors are let go on every shore of earth. Our arms have protected the oppressed, and struck down or punished the oppressor. The boom of a British gun is felt by millions to have right, as well as might, in its music; and the roll of our drums has rarely been the signal of retreat; or, if of retreat, it has been a retreat covered with a richer glory than the advance.

> "The wide seas peopled: hence the shores
> Of Britain are resorted to by ships
> Freighted from every climate of the world
> With the world's choicest produce. Hence that sum
> Of keels that rest within her crowded ports,
> Or ride at anchor in her sounds and bays;
> That animating spectacle of sails,
> That through her inland regions to and fro
> Pass with the respirations of the tide
> Perpetual, multitudinous! Finally,
> Hence a dread arm of floating power—a voice
> Of thunder, daunting those who would approach
> With hostile purposes the blessed Isle;
> Truth's consecrated residence—the seat
> Impregnable of Liberty and Peace!"

I cannot resist adding to the chapter a very illustrative statement by the Dean of Canterbury. It appeared in 'Good Words,' and coming from the pen of Dean Alford, it is of real weight:

"The Church of Rome calls itself Christian: the city of Rome gives itself out as the Metropolis of the Christian world. And, doubtless, the Church of Rome is based upon Christianity, and the city of Rome is full of Christian names and Christian emblems. But notwithstanding, a strong conviction possesses me, that what really happened in the much-vaunted reign of Constantine was really a victory of Paganism, not a defeat. It was with idolatry, as with Greece—'Græcia capta ferum victorem cepit:'—'The captive Greece her victor captive led.' And this conviction has been wrought irresistibly in me by what I have seen and heard during a winter in Rome.

"Rome is essentially a Pagan city. Her churches, numerous as the days of the year, rise everywhere around you. Bells are continually going; the commemoration of saints and martyrs is endless. Yet, with very rare exceptions indeed, the *worship of the people* in those churches has nothing in common with Christianity. It is not even the one God of Jews and Christians who, as a matter of fact, is adored in them; it is not He whom Christians believe to be God blessed for ever, incarnate in the flesh of man. God has passed out from the practical worship of this people; the Son of God has, as matter of fact, ceased to be an object of their adoration. The Eternal Father is found in their pictures as an old man,—the Divine Saviour as a little child; but both are subservient, and nearly all their worship is subservient, to one purpose—to the glorification of a great goddess, and, after her, not of the Father, Son, nor Spirit, but of a host of men and women, made into objects of adoration by themselves, and, whatever may be alleged to the contrary, clothed, as she is pre-eminently clothed, with the incommunicable attributes of the Godhead itself."

"I know I am making strong assertions. But the facts themselves are stronger. I shall have to adduce them, somewhat in abundance, by-and-by. But now I will go on to say more.

"The Jewish Church had fallen far in the time of our Lord's ministry on earth. But the Romish Church has fallen further now. The demon of idolatry had been cast out by the judgment of the Captivity. His habitation had been left empty and garnished; and he had returned, not in the same form, but in the worst shape, of hypocrisy. In the system of the modern Church of Rome, not only are hypocrisy and lying tolerated and encouraged, but idolatry, gross as that of Nineveh or Greece, and grosser than that of Imperial Rome, has entered in and repossessed her people.

"More is yet behind. There is hardly a charge brought by our blessed Lord against the Scribes and Pharisees in St. Matthew xxiii., which does not find examples among the priesthood of modern Rome. The binding on men heavy burdens, which they themselves touch not; the inordinate lust for distinction and outward display; the shutting up the kingdom of Heaven against men, neither going in themselves, nor suffering them that would enter to go in; the devouring widows' houses, and for a pretence making long prayers; the compassing sea and land to make one proselyte, and when he is made, making him twofold worse than themselves; the drawing false and unwarranted distinction between sins venial and sins deadly; the frittering away the religious life upon contemptible trifles, and omitting the weightier matters of the law, —straining out the gnat, while they swallow the camel; the making clean the outside of the cup and platter, while within they are full of extortion and excess; the building and garnishing the sepul-

chres of the martyrs, while they themselves are treading in the steps of their persecutors; all these might have been first written as descriptions of the character and conduct of the priesthood and priestly rules of modern Rome. There are exceptions; and, thank God, not a few. But these are exceptions, likewise, to the system. A *good priest* is as the word is now understood, a *bad Catholic*. The system, as now laid down, and now practised, is one of hypocrisy, of extortion, of falsehood, of cruelty. 'The preaching is of cursing and lies;' the practice, such as I shall have to show before this letter is done.

"But it may be well to begin by speaking of outward and palpable things—the fruits by which the priestly government must be judged and known. And first, for the peace and security of the city. To insure these is the bounden duty of every government. There may be cases where it is extremely difficult; where the magistrates are hampered in power, or the people brutalized by ages of bad government; but neither of these can be the case at Rome. Here we have the most absolute monarch in the world, ruling a capital by no means large, with a numerous staff of military and police; and, besides, assisted by 20,000 French troops. And besides this, we have here a people whose state, physical, moral, and intellectual, is the result of accumulated centuries of a government and institutions, according to the advocates of the Papacy, the best in the world, and administered by infallible wisdom, unerring justice, spotless integrity, and unimpeachable truth. How, then, does it stand with Rome in point of security and good order?

"Unquestionably, in both these points, it is the worst city in the civilised world. And it is so, not in spite of the honest efforts of its rulers, but with the connivance, and, it is much to be feared, often

with the concurrence, of its rulers. Robbery and murder are the commonest occurrences in the streets of Rome; detection, restitution, punishment, are occurrences the most uncommon.

"In order to furnish a characteristic and instructive example, it may not be amiss to give somewhat in detail the narrative of a case of street-murder which occurred during this present spring, and has made a deep impression on all classes and parties.

"Two young men, clerks in the Exchange-office of Signor Baldini, opposite the Chigi Palace in the Corso, had long been in the habit of carrying the money of the day home to their master's bank every evening. They always went in the same hired carriage, and by the same way. On Saturday, February 20, 1864, they were passing in this carriage and on this business, at half-past seven o'clock, up the street called the Via in Lucina. They were at a point not more than seventy paces from the Corso itself, out of which the Via in Lucina turns at right angles. At that time, and especially on a Saturday evening, the Corso is usually crowded with people; and every night, as soon as it is dusk, Papal and French patrols are stationed along its whole length, at the distance of a few paces apart. Such were the attendant circumstances of the time and place.

"At the point above mentioned the Via in Lucina suddenly narrows, having passed an eating-shop, which projects into it and faces the Corso. A few steps beyond the corner of this house, and opposite to its side entrance, the two clerks were attacked by six armed men, dragged out of their carriage, and literally cut to pieces on the pavement. One of them died on the spot; the other, in the hospital early next morning. The sum carried off by the robbers was 8,500 Roman scudi (upwards of 1,700*l.*).

Of course they escaped, and up to this time have not been taken.

"Why '*of course?*' Let the following facts reply to the question. First of all, there is, sad to say, a general conviction that the police themselves are, if not sometimes the perpetrators of these outrages, at least cognisant of them, and sharers in the plunder. No one who knows anything of the history of street outrages in Rome will be surprised at such, right or wrong, being the impression on the public mind. It is well known that the police can, whenever it pleases them, find out the stolen goods and restore them. It is also well known that, in other cases, no amount of the clearest evidence is sufficient to bring a criminal to justice. Indeed, the very name of justice is wrongly used when predicated of any proceeding in the court of law at Rome. All is secret, all is arbitrary, all is venal. Any length of time may elapse between apprehension and trial, during which time the evidence may be suppressed in a hundred ways, or, if it be worth the trouble, false evidence suborned.

"Connected with this arbitrary method of proceeding is another cause why the robbers escaped free! To give evidence, in Rome, is rather worse than being accused. The unfortunate passer-by who witnesses a crime is summoned from day to day, when there is no prospect of the case being judged; is compelled to attend without any compensation for his time, and if he is known to have given evidence to inculpate, becomes a marked victim for the future revenge of the assassin. Hence, not unnaturally, the universal practice among the Romans is, when anything unusual occurs in the street, to turn out of the way instantly, that they may not witness it. On the commission of the bloody deed above related, the street was instantly empty, and the poor vic-

tims were left without help, while the robbers got safe off.

"As may be conceived, the public indignation at such an atrocious outrage has been raised to the highest. That in a city with two police establishments, numbering many thousand men, and garrisoned by 20,000 French soldiers, that common safety for life and property should not be attained which the presence of a few dozen policemen insures in many a city in England, implies great blame somewhere or other. The members of the police force are notoriously disreputable; the government itself is known to be corrupt; criminals escape, and are sheltered; what wonder, if the most damaging inferences are drawn; what wonder if, day by day, the cup of public indignation is filling to the brim, and demanding the expulsion from power of a prince and his satellites who do not choose to fulfil the very first conditions of the tenure of power?

"On this occasion, as on every other when its conduct has been called in question, the Papal Government attempted to throw dust in men's eyes. Immediately after the murder, two men were arrested, who were not the murderers. Rome was quieted for a few days, and the escape of the real criminals, we may believe, has been thus secured. Meantime, the Secret National Committee of moderate liberals have addressed to the French general in command a respectful and temperate letter, representing to him that if it is necessary, for high reasons of state, that the Romans should, by 20,000 bayonets, be prohibited from putting themselves under a better Government, at least those who thus prohibit them should provide for the public security. If, being so well able to do this, they do it not, they make themselves accomplices of the corrupt

and incompetent power which their presence here tends to shore up and prolong.

"Rome, they urge, has become, by invitation and encouragement of the priestly Government, the resort of the very dregs of mankind. The guilty, the disaffected, the poltroons who escape the military levies, the reactionary Neapolitans, all find welcome here. It is known for a fact, that priests who have been compelled to fly from the kingdom of Italy, not for political reasons, but for the foulest and most revolting crimes against nature, are harboured and favoured here. Rome, in its present state, is a disgrace to Christendom, and a blot upon humanity itself.

"I state these things in the fulfilment of a solemn duty. The interests and the immortal hopes of thousands are at stake in this matter. Those of whom I am bringing up the evil report are consummate masters of the art of finesse and intrigue. They can, and they do, deny whatever it suits them to deny. In England, their partisans adopt the plan of meeting with a direct negative, whenever it is safe to do so, any assertion which may be made respecting corrupt practices here at Rome. Here, in Rome, the most atrocious falsehoods are printed in the Papal journals respecting England, her institutions, the spirit of her government, the state of her population. They know that they are safe in making their assertions. No reply can be inserted in any public organ (if this name can be given to the two miserable daily prints sent forth by the Government) without sanction of the rulers, which is sure to be refused. 'From what we hear and read in the papers,' said a Roman to a friend of mine, 'England must be a perfect hell upon earth!'

"The lamentable part of the matter for an Englishman who witnesses all this is, not the hearing his beloved country thus traduced (for when he once

knows the men, blame from them becomes the richest praise, as praise from them would indeed be cause of shame), but it is to see his ingenuous countrymen and countrywomen taking in with all simplicity the false and honeyed words of these bad men—to see silly girls, only half trained at home in the Christian faith, drawn by degrees into their nets, till they are hopelessly and fatally entangled—to hear, in general society, the most exalted encomiums passed on men whose lives and words are deserving of anything rather than praise; and every now and then to hear of this or that weak and miserable person forsaking the faith and 'going over' to worship images, and believe delusions, and uphold the monstrous lie of modern Romanism."

The fall and utter destruction of this system flow logically from the fact of the existence of a holy God —the inspiration of the Bible—and the law of retribution. What is corrupt must die; what is holy and true will last for ever.

IX.

INTOLERANT AND PERSECUTING.

EVERY Roman Catholic bishop and archbishop in England and throughout the continent of Europe and in America makes the following oath. Every clause binds him who takes it to the obligation of voting and working everywhere and always for the absolute supremacy of the Pope.

The oath taken by the bishops of the Church of Rome is as follows:—

"Ego N. Electus Ecclesiæ N. ab hac hora in antea fidelis et obediens ero B. Petro Apostolo, Sanctæque Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et Domino nostro, Domino N. Papæ N. suisque successoribus canonicè intrantibus. Non ero in consilio, aut consensu, vel facto, ut vitam perdant, aut membrum; seu capiantur mala captione; aut in eos manus quomodolibet ingerantur; vel injuriæ aliquæ inferantur, quovis quæsito colore. Consilium verò quod mihi credituri sunt, per se, aut Nuncios suos, seu literas, ad eorum damnum, me sciente nemini pandam. Papatum Romanum et Regalia Sancti Petri adjutor eis ero ad defendendum et retinendum, salvo meo ordine, contra omnem hominem. Le-

"I, N. Elect of the Church of N. from henceforward will be faithful and obedient to St. Peter the Apostle, and to the holy Roman Church, and to our Lord, the Lord N. Pope N. and to his successors canonically coming in. I will neither advise, consent, or do anything that may lose life or member, *or that their persons may be seized, or hands anywise laid upon them, or any injuries offered to them* under any pretence whatsoever. The COUNSEL which they shall entrust me withal, by themselves, their messengers, or letters, I will not *knowingly reveal* to any to their prejudice. I will help them to defend and keep the *Roman Papacy* and the *Royalties of St. Peter* (saving my

gatum Apostolicæ Sedis in eundo et redeundo honorificè tractabo, et in suis necessitatibus adjuvabo. Jura, honores, privilegia, et auctoritatem Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, Domini nostri Papæ et Successorum prædictorum conservare, defendere, augere, promovere curabo. Neque ero in consilio, vel facto, seu tractatu in quibus contra ipsum Dominum nostrum, vel eandem Romanam Ecclesiam aliqua sinistra vel præjudicialia, personarum, juris, honoris, status et potestatis, eorum machinentur. Et si talia à quibuscunque tractari vel procurari novero, impediam hoc pro posse, et quanto citiùs potero significabo eidem Domino nostro, vel alteri per quem possit ad ipsius notitiam pervenire. Regulas Sanctorum Patrum, decreta, ordinationes, seu dispositiones, reservationes, provisiones et mandata Apostolica totis viribus observabo, et faciam ab aliis observari. Hæreticos, Schismaticos et Rebelles eidem Domino nostro vel successoribus prædictis pro posse persequar et impugnabo. Vocatus ad Synodum veniam, nisi præpeditus fuero canonica præpeditione. Apostolorum limina singulis trienniis personaliter per me ipsum visitabo, et Domino nostro ac successoribus præfatis rationem reddam de toto meo pastorali officio ac de rebus omnibus ad meæ Ecclesiæ statum, ad cleri, et populi disciplinam, animarum denique quæ meæ fidei traditæ sunt, salutem quovismodo pertinentibus, et vicissim mandata Apostolica humiliter recipiam et quàm diligentissimè exequar. Quod si legitimo impedimento detentus fuero præfata omnia ad

order), against all men. The legate of the Apostolic see, going and coming, I will honourably treat and help in his necessities. The rights, honours, privileges, and *authority of the holy Roman Church, of our Lord the Pope and his foresaid successors, I will endeavour to preserve, defend, increase and advance.* I will not be in any counsel, action, or treaty in which shall be plotted against our said Lord, and the said Roman Church anything to the hurt or prejudice of their persons, right, honour, state, or power: and if I shall know any such thing to be treated or agitated by any whatsoever, I will hinder it to my power; and as soon as I can will signify it to our said Lord, or to some other by whom it may come to his knowledge. The rules of the holy Fathers, the Apostolic decrees, ordinances, or disposals, reservations, provisions, and mandates, I will observe with all my might, and cause to be observed by others. Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to our said Lord or his foresaid successors I will to my utmost power persecute and wage war with. I will come to a Council when I am called, unless I be hindered by a canonical impediment. I will by myself in person visit the threshold of the Apostles every three years; and give an account to our Lord and his foresaid successors of all my pastoral office, and of all things anywise belonging to the state of my church, to the discipline of my clergy and people, and lastly to the salvation of souls committed to my trust; and will in like manner humbly receive and

implebo per certum Nuntium ad hoc speciale mandatum habentem de gremio mei Capituli, aut alium in dignitate Ecclesiastica constitutum, seu aliàs personatum habentem; aut, his mihi deficientibus, per diœcesanum Sacerdotem; et clero deficiente omnino per aliquem alium Presbyterum sæcularem vel regularem spectatæ probitatis et religionis de supradictis omnibus plenè instructum. De hujusmodi autem impedimento docebo per legitimas probationes ad Sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ Cardinalem Proponentem in Congregatione Sacri Concilii per supradictum Nuntium transmittendas. Possessiones verò ad mensam meam pertinentes non vendam, nec dona neque impignorabo, nec de novo infeudabo vel aliquo modo alienabo, etiam cum consensu Capituli Ecclesiæ meæ, inconsulto Romano Pontifice. Et si ad aliquam alienationem devenero, pœnas in quandam super hoc edita constitutione contentas eo ipso incurre revolo. Sic me Deus adjuvet et hæc Sancta Dei Evangelia." (De consecratione Electi in episcopum. Pontificale Romanum, pp. 59–61. Antverpiæ, 1627.) (Romæ, 1738, vol. i. p. 178.)

diligently execute the Apostolic commands. And if I be detained by a lawful impediment, I will perform all the things aforesaid by a certain messenger hereto specially empowered, a member of my chapter, or some other in ecclesiastical dignity or else having a parsonage; or in default of these, by a priest of the diocese; or in default of one of the clergy (of the diocese) by some other secular or regular priest of approved integrity and religion, fully instructed in all things above mentioned. And such impediment I will make out by lawful proofs to be transmitted by the foresaid messenger to the Cardinal proponent of the holy Roman Church in the congregation of the Sacred Council. The possessions belonging to my table I will neither sell nor give away, nor mortgage, nor grant anew in fee, nor anywise alienate, no not even with the consent of the chapter of my church, without consulting the Roman Pontiff. And if I shall make any alienation, I will thereby incur the penalties contained in a certain constitution put forth about this matter. So help me God and these holy Gospels of God."

Dr. Doyle stated in St. George's Cathedral in 1850, that bishops and archbishops do take an oath, and in that oath, each "promises to pursue and combat error, and to uphold the sacred doctrines of the Church. Surely it is not a dreadful thing to swear to combat error." Dr. Doyle added: "They talk of the edict of Queen Mary, and lay it at the door of the Catholic clergy. Now the true version of Queen Mary's edict, in connection with the Catholic clergy,

is this: On the very day that edict was sent forth, that great and good and fearless friar, Alphonzo de Castro, when he preached before the Court, in the presence of her Majesty, denounced it as most intolerant, unjust, and in every degree opposed to the glorious principles and spirit of our holy religion. That fearless man, in the name of the Church denounced the acts of Mary as opposed to the Church; and it is the same Church now as in the day that De Castro defended it."

When the Bishop says that the principles of the Church are to-day precisely what they were as exemplified by Alphonzo de Castro, one would naturally feel, this Alphonzo de Castro must have been a grand exception amid the Liguoris and Aquinases. He of course never persecuted heretics, he ever denounced everything like proscription, confiscation of property, destruction of life, deposition of sovereigns, release of subjects from the oaths of their allegiance. Praised by a bishop, the mouthpiece of a cardinal in the cardinal's own cathedral, in the pulpit which a cardinal was wont to occupy, would not one suppose this Alphonzo de Castro, reprobating the deeds of his fathers, denouncing the persecution of Mary, declared to be the true exponent of the charity, the meekness, and the mildness of the Church of Rome, would present in his writings all that is charitable, lovely, amiable, as Christianity can be depicted, and mild as Rome would wish herself to be exhibited "*under the British Crown*," and before the British people? When I heard that Bishop Doyle had recommended Alphonzo de Castro as an expositor of the gentleness and mildness of his Church, I sent to the Continent for Alphonzo de Castro. Alphonzo de Castro was a friar, made an archbishop just before his death, and no doubt if he had lived longer, such were his principles, he would have been a cardinal.

The title of his book is 'Alfonsi de Castro Zamorensis, ordinis minorum, regularis observantiæ, provinciæ sancti Jacobi. In quo libri tres de justa Hæreticorum punitione, utque libri duo de potestate legis Pœnalis Continentur. Madrid, 1773.' This is the writer recommended by Bishop Doyle as a true exponent of his Church; who, he says, rebuked the sanguinary edicts of Queen Mary, and who is, in fact, the true representative of what the Church of Rome is, and what the Church of Rome should be.

This exponent of the Church of Rome, this rebuker of Queen Mary for her persecution, this meek and excellent, "this great and good and courageous friar," says—

"Multæ et variæ sunt pœnæ, quibus Ecclesiasticæ sanctiones, Impertatorumque leges hæreticos plecti jubent. Quædam enim sunt spirituales pœnæ, quæ animam solam respiciunt. Aliæ sunt corporales, quæ corpus affligunt. De singulis suo ordine dicemus, et primo de corporalibus, postea vero de spiritualibus pœnis disseremus. Inter corporales pœnas, una ej, quæ non parum hæreticos vexat, est bonorum omnium proscriptio et confiscatio."

"There are various punishments with which ecclesiastical sanctions and imperial laws order heretics to be punished. Some are spiritual, and affect the soul alone; others are corporal, and afflict the body. We will speak of each in its order, and first of corporal punishment, and afterwards about spiritual. Among corporal punishments one which very much annoys heretics is the proscription and confiscation of their property."—Cap. v. p. 98.

"Altera hereticorum pœna est, privatio cujuscumque prælationis jurisdictionis, et dominii, quod ante super homines cujuscumque conditionis habuissent. Nam qui hæreticus est, ipso jure omnibus talibus rebus privatus est."

"Another punishment of heretics is the deprival of every sort of pre-eminence, jurisdiction, and government, which they previously exercised over persons of every condition. For he who is a heretic is, *ipso jure*, deprived of all such things."—Cap. vii. p. 105.

"Hoc dominium habent reges, duces, comites, et reliqui domini qui populis præsunt. Hi super quos tale dominium habetur, non dicuntur servi, sed subditi, et vocabulo jam ab omnibus re-

"This authority have kings, dukes, earls, and other governors who rule the people. Those over whom this authority is exercised are not called servants, but subjects; they are also called by the

cepto, dicuntur vassalli. Hoc dominium etiam amittitur per hæresim manifestam, ita quod Rex factus hæreticus; ipso jure est regno suo privatus, et Dux suo ducatu, et Comes comitatu, et idem de aliis populorum dominis quocumque nominine censeantur, dicendum est. Nam de omni dominio generaliter loquitur illud cap. fin. de hæret. Nec mirari debet aliquis, quod Papa propter hæresis crimen Regem à regia dignitate deponat, et regno privet: quoniam in negotio fidei etiam Reges, sicut et alii inferiores, subduntur Summo Pontifici. Quo fit ut illos sicut quoslibet alios punire possit."

universally received term, vassals. This authority is also lost by manifest heresy; thus a king, having become a heretic is, *ipso jure*, deprived of his kingdom, a duke of his dukedom, an earl of his earldom; and so with other governors of the people by whatever name they are known, Nor should any one wonder that the Pope, on account of the crime of heresy, deprives a king of his royal dignity, and strips him of his kingdom; for in the matter of faith, kings, like other subordinates, are the subjects of the Sovereign Pontiff, who can punish them as he does others." —Cap. vii. p. 108.

This was recommended from the cathedral pulpit of St. George's, at the time of the Papal aggression.

"Si Rex fiat hæreticus, ad quem regni illius dominium, et potestas jure devolvetur? Non quidem ad Imperatorem, præsertim si Rex non erat Imperatori subjectus, quales sunt Hispanorum, Gallorum, et Anglorum Reges."

"Si Rex hæreticus nullum habet hæredem aut ille quem habet, est etiam hæreticus, tunc si regnum non est etiam hæresi infectum, dicerem Regnum ipsum habere jus et potestatem eligendi Regem, juxta id, quod in primo lib. Regum dicitur: *Populus facit sibi Regem.* Si vero regnum est etiam eâdem peste infectum sicut Rex, regnum etiam erit ipso jure privatum potestate eligendi sibi Regem, et tunc negotium devolvetur ad Summum Pontificem."

"If the King become a heretic, on whom does the sovereignty and power devolve? Not on the Emperor, especially if the King be not subject to the Emperor, such as the kings of Spain, France, and England."—Cap. vii. p. 108.

"If an heretical king have no heir, or if the heir be also a heretic, then if the nation be not infected with heresy, I should say it has the power and right of electing the king, as it is said in the 1st Book of Kings, 'The people makes itself a king.' But if the people be infected with the same pestilence (of heresy) as the king, the people will be deprived, *ipso jure*, of the power of choosing for itself a king, and then the business will devolve on the Sovereign Pontiff."—Cap. vii. p. 108.

I. "Ultima se jam offert corporis pœna mors scilicet, qua hæ-

"The last punishment of the body for heretics is death, with

reticos, nisi tempestive resipiscant, juste puniendos esse apertissime Deo favente demonstrabimus."

"Quo fit, ut ad tanti criminis horrorem, et odium aliis ingenerandum, justum sit hæretico incorrigibili mortis pœnam inferre."

"At nullum est (ut super libro primo docuimus) gravius hæresi peccatum, nullum est ergo crimen cujus odium sit Christiano viro magis incutiendum, et inde per consequens sequitur, ut nullum sit crimen pro quo justius aliquis possit occidi, quam pro hæresi fixa et insanabili. Si Martinus Lutherus, cum primum cœpit effundere venenum suum, et legitime admonitus noluit resipiscere, fuisset (ut decebat) capitis animadversione punitus; cæteri timorem habuissent, et non prorumpissent tot tantæque pestiferæ hæreticorum factiones, quales, proh dolor! hodie Germania sustinet. Sed quia impunio evasit Lutherus, ausi sunt prodire in publicum et suas effutire hæreses Œcolampadius, Zuinglius, Carolstadius, et omnium hæreticorum pessimi Anabaptistæ."

which we will prove by God's assistance heretics ought to be punished."—Cap. xii. p. 123.

"It hence comes to pass, in order to create a horror of so great a crime, and to produce in others detestation of it, that it is just to inflict the punishment of death on an incorrigible heretic."—Cap. xii. p. 126.

"But there is no greater sin (as we have shown above, in book first), than that of heresy, and therefore there is no crime the hatred of which is more to be impressed on a Christian. Whence it follows that there is no crime for which one may be more justly put to death than for fixed and incurable heresy. If Martin Luther, when he first began to pour out his poison, and after being lawfully admonished would not repent, had been capitally punished as he deserved, his followers would have been terrified, and there would not have burst forth so many and so great heresies as, alas! Germany now endures. But because Luther escaped with impunity, Œcolampadius, Zwingle, Carlstadt, and the Anabaptists, the worst of all heretics, dared to go abroad in public and vent their heresies."—Cap. xii. p. 126.

He gives an account of the different modes in which heretics are to be publicly treated: he says—

"Ostendimus jam satis (ut opinor) aperte justum esse, ut hæreticus occidatur, quo autem genere mortis sit occidendus, parum ad rem facit. Nam quocumque modo occidatur, semper consulitur Ecclesiæ; quia semper tollitur nocumentum, quod vivens

"We have shown already, plainly enough, as I think, that a heretic may be put to death, but in what manner he may be put to death is of very little consequence. For in whatsoever way a heretic may be put to death, it is always for the

aliis præstare posset, et aliis incutitur timor, ne similia docere, aut quomodolibet dicere audeant."

"In Flandria et aliis inferioris Germaniæ partibus, quum ego illic ante annos decem versarer, vidi hæreticos capitis obtruncatione puniri. In Geldria tamen hæretici manibus et pedibus legati jussu Caroli tunc Geldriæ Ducis, in flumen aliquod mittebantur vivi, ut a flumine aliquod absorberentur. Eodem genere mortis (ut à multis qui viderunt audivi) punitus est Antverpiæ quidam insignio Lutheranus jussu Dominæ Margaretæ Caroli Cæsaris Amitæ quæ tunc ob Cæsaris absentiam, patrium illam gubernat. Audivi etiam Brugis in Flandria à multis fide dignis oculatis testibus consuetum esse in illâ civitate, hæreticos vivos mittere, in oleum fervens utab eo citissime comburerentur."

"In cæteris Christiani orbis Regnis, aut provinciis, nota, perpetua, et inviolabilis est consuetudo hæreticos igne comburere; sic vidi fieri in Francia, præsertim Lutetiæ. Sic in Hispania, et credo sic factum, fuisse semper in Italia. Nam beatus Gregorius libro primo dialogorum, cap. 4, narrat Basilium quemdam Magum Romæ combustum esse, et rem gestam laudat."

"Ex quibus verbis apertissime obstat non esse recentem inventionem, sed antequissimam sapientum Christianorum sententiam hæreticos esse igne cremandos."

good of the Church, because a nuisance is always removed, which, if alive he may create; and terror is struck on others, so that, they shall not dare to teach or in any way speak such things."—Cap, xii. p. 128.

"In Flanders and other parts of Lower Germany, when I was there ten years ago, I saw heretics punished by decapitation. In Guelders, however, heretics, tied by the hands and feet, by order of Charles Duke of Guelders, were cast alive into a river, there to be swallowed up by the stream. A Lutheran was punished in this way at Antwerp, as I heard from many that saw it, by order of Lady Margaret, aunt of Charles Cæsar, who, in Cæsar's absence, governs that country. I heard also at Bruges in Flanders, from many eye-witnesses worthy of credit, that it was the custom in that city to cast heretics alive into boiling oil, that they might thus be the more speedily burned." — Cap. xii. p. 128.

"In other kingdoms and provinces of the Christian world there is a known, inviolable, and perpetual custom of burning heretics. I have seen it thus done in France, especially at Paris. So also in Spain, and I believe it to have been always thus done in Italy. For St. Gregory, in his first book of Dialogues, cap. 4, states that a certain magician was burned at Rome, and praises the transaction."

"From which words it is abundantly plain that it is not a modern invention, but that it is the ancient opinion of wise Christians, that heretics should be burned with fire."

"Quo fit, ut postquam, de illius hæresi post mortem constiterit corpus illius si ab aliis fidelium corporibus possit discerni, sit ab ipsa sepultura, tamquam a re injuste possessa, separandum, et extra Ecclesiam ejiciendum. Sic enim Consilium Constantieuse de corpore Joannis Wicleff hæretici jam tunc defuncti, censuit esse faciendum."

"Postquam totum hoc opus, de justa hæreticorum punitione, absolverem, juvenem quemdam in sacramentali confessione peccata sua mihi referentem, audire contigit, quem cum de rebus ad fidem et Christianam religionem spectantibus interrogarem, invenissemque rectam illum et Catholicam fidem tenere; quæsivi deinde ab illo, an hæreticum aliquem latentem agnosceret, et an cum aliquo hujusmodi conversationem aliquam habuisset. Cui quæstioni respondens: aperte dixit se scire patrem suum esse hæreticum, propterea quod illum in fide adeo pertinaciter errare viderat, ut sæpe ab eo admonitus nunquam ille voluerit errorem suum deserere; immo potius contra pater, nitebatur eundem filium in errorem suum trahere. Hoc ego audiens, hortabar filium ut patris crimen quamlibet occultum Inquisitoribus revelaret, et quamvis id necessario esse faciendum multis evidentibus rationibus convincerem, nunquam tamen ut id facere vellet, illi persuadere potui. Nam hoc scuto se tuebatur, quod non erat decens neque ratio naturalis patiebatur ut filius patrem ad mortem duceret."

"Ex quibus omnibus apertissime constat eum, qui secreto

"Whence it is that one has been convicted of heresy, after death, his body, if it can be distinguished from the bodies of the faithful, is to be separated from burial as from an unjust privilege, and cast without the Church. For thus the Council of Constance decided it to be done in the case of the body of John Wycliffe after his death."—Cap. xix. p. 158.

"After I had completed this work about the just punishment of heretics, I happened to hear a young man relating to me all sins in sacramental confession. When I had questioned him concerning the Christian faith and religion, and found that he held the true Catholic faith, I asked him whether he knew of any concealed heretics, and whether he had conversed with any such. To this question he openly replied that he knew his father to be a heretic, for he had seen him so pertinaciously err in the faith, that he had often admonished him concerning it, but he would never forsake his errors; he strove, on the contrary, to lead his son into them. On hearing this, I advised the son to reveal the hidden crime of the father to the Inquisitors; and although I convinced him by many evident reasons that this should of necessity be done, yet I could not persuade him to do it; for he shielded himself by saying that it was not becoming or natural that a son should lead his father to death."—Cap. xxvi. p. 185.

"From all these things it is plain that he who knows any one

novit aliquem hæreticum, non teneri ad servandum ordinem illum correptionis fraternæ a Christo salvatore nostro præfixum."

to be a heretic is not bound to observe the order of fraternal correction laid down by Christ our Saviour."—Cap. xxvi. p. 182.

We can identify Pope Pius IX. with Pope Pius V., who was made a saint, and for whom there is a collect in the Missal and Breviary, in which collect it is said: "O God, who in order to crush the enemies of thy Church (*ad conterendos hostes*), didst deign to elect blessed Pius the chief Priest," &c.

In a letter to the Vicomte de Falloux, author of the 'Life of Pius V.,' Pius IX. states—

"L'ouvrage dans lequel vous retracez la vie du saint pontife Pie V. nous est parvenu, et nous a été très agréable, a nous qui nous appellons du nom de notre si grand predecesseur, bien que nous manquions de ses vertus. Mais de même que nous l'avons choisi pour patron au premier jour de notre souverain pontificat, de même nous continuons a lui addresser nos instantes supplications, afin que sous ce patronage le courage ne nous fasse jamais défaut, et que nous puissons comme lui servir le troupeau du Christ par la parole et par l'exemple."—Donne a Rome, le 5 juillet, 1847. Pie IX.

"The work in which you have traced the life of the holy Pontiff Pius V. has been received, and has been very agreeable to us, called as we are by the name of so great a predecessor, though wanting in many of his virtues. As we have chosen him as our patron, on the first day of our sovereign pontificate, so we continue to address our instant supplications to him, that under his patronage we may not lack courage, and that we may be able, like him, to defend the flock of Christ, by word and by example."—Given at Rome on St. Mary Major, 5th July, 1847, the second year of our Pontificate. Pius IX.

Pius IX. declares that the example and the sentiments of Pius V. are to be his example and sentiments. What was the history of this Pope Pius V.? He was a great supporter of the Inquisition, promoter of the Bull 'In Cœnâ Domini,' and the author of an infamous Bull for dethroning Queen Elizabeth. "Christ," says Pius V., whose example Pius IX. is to follow, and whose teaching he accepts, "has con-

stituted me king over all nations and realms, to pluck up, destroy, scatter, demolish, and build." "The said Queen Elizabeth," he adds, "we deprive of her pretended right to the kingdom, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatever; and absolve all nobles, subjects, and people of the kingdom, and whoever have sworn to her, from their oath and all duty whatever."—Mag. Bull., vol. ii., p. 324, Luxembourg, 1727.

Here you find written what Pope Pius V. did to Queen Elizabeth. His example and teaching Pius IX. says he is ready to follow. There is another queen upon the throne now, the splendour of whose crown eclipses that of Elizabeth's, and whose love of Protestantism is, if possible, stronger, and certainly purer than hers. Whether what Pius V. taught in that Bull, in an unchangeable Church, and what he did by that Bull, was right, I care not now to inquire. Pius IX. holds he does nothing wrong in warning us that he will imitate the same example, that he will do the same deed—*pro posse—i. e.*, when he has the power.

What are the royalties of St. Peter and his successors, or the sovereign pretensions of the Pope? Baronius states—

"Politicum Principatum sacerdotali esse subjectum nulla potest esse dubitatio."	"There can be no doubt that the political power is subject to the sacerdotal."

The canon law of the Church of Rome ('Corpus Juris Canonici'), in two volumes, contains constitutions, decretals, bulls, and the canons of the Council of Trent. There is also the Bullarium Magnum, and Labbe and Cossart's Sacred Councils. In the bull of Pope Sixtus V. against Henry, King of Navarre, it is said—

"Ab immensa eterni Regis potentiâ Beatro Pedro ejusque	"The authority given to St. Peter and his successors by the

successoribus tradita auctoritas omnes terrenorum Regum et Principum supereminet potestates. Dominus regnis, nos illos, illorumque posteros privamus in perpetuum. A juramento hujusmodi ac omni prorsus dominis fidelitatis, et obsequii debito, illos omnes tam universe quam singulatim auctoritate præsentium absolvimus et liberamus; præcipimusque et interdicimus eis universis et singulis ne illis eorumque monitis legibus et mandatis audeant obedire."

immense power of the eternal King, excels all the powers of earthly kings and princes. We deprive them, and their posterity for ever, of their dominions and kingdoms. By the authority of these presents we do absolve and set free all persons, as well jointly as severally, from any such oath, and from all allegiance whatever, in regard of dominion, fealty, and obedience; and do charge and forbid all and every of them that they do not dare to obey them, or any of their admonitions, laws, and commands."—Bulla Sixti V. Contr. Henry Navarre, &c.

Pope Boniface has a decree in the Canon Law—

"Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omni humanæ creaturæ declaramus, dicimus, diffinimus et pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis."

"Moreover we declare, assert, define, and pronounce it to be of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff."—Extrav. Comm. lib. i. tit. 8. p. 1160. Pars. 2. Leips. 1839.

He says also—

"Opportet gladium esse sub gladio, et temporalem auctoritatem spirituali subjici potestati. . . . Ergo. si deviat terrena, judicabitur a potestate spirituali."

"One sword must be under the other sword, and temporal authority must be subject to spiritual power. . . . Whence, if the earthly authority go wrong, it shall be judged by the spiritual."—Ibid. p. 1159.

I find in a bull of Leo X. passed in the Lateran Council—

"Constitutionem ipsam, sacro præsenti concilio approbante, innovamus et approbamus."

"We do renew and approve this constitution with the approbation of this present holy Council." — Concil. Lat. Sess. 11. p. 153. vol. xiv. Paris, 1671.

Now, both Pope and Council have decided that

the civil power must be subject to the spiritual power. Melchior Canus, quoting this, says—

"Quam extravagantem renovavit et approbavit concilium Lateranense sub Leone X."

"The Lateran Council under Leo X. did renew and approve that constitution."—Lib. vi. cap. 4. p. 316. Colon. 1605.

Baronius, the Roman Catholic historian, says—

"Hæc Bonifacius, cui assentiuntur omnes, ut nullus discrepat, nisi qui dissidio ab Ecclesiâ excidit."

"This all assent to, so that no one dissents who does not by such disagreement cut himself off from the Church."—Baron, anno 1053, S. 14. vol. ii. Rome, 1605.

Nothing can be stronger than this. Either the Church of Rome, as represented by her Popes and her Councils, has erred, and proved herself fallible, or Archbishop Manning holds that Queen Victoria's sceptre is to be subject to his crosier.

Innocent IV. (Lab., vol. ii. p. 1. col. 640., Paris, 1671), deposed the Emperor Frederick II., and enjoined none to obey or regard him, absolving his subjects from their oath of allegiance. And Matthew Paris (ann. 1253) says Innocent called kings *mancipia Papæ*, the tools or puppets made over to the Pope as his property. Innocent III. deposed Otho IV., "Imperatorem ab Imperio depositum percussit." (Naucl. ann. 1212.)

Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, when examined before the House of Lords, declared the persecuting canon of the fourth Council of Lateran to be spurious, and not to be found in the original copy. In the canon law, edit. 1839, I find that Gregory IX., predecessor of Innocent IV., inserted in his decretals the notorious decree of the fourth Lateran, held by Innocent III.—

"Excommunicamus et anathematizamus omnem heresim extollentem se adversus hanc sanctam, orthodoxam et Catholicam fidem

"We excommunicate and anathematize every heresy exalting itself against that holy, orthodox, and catholic faith, which we have

quam superius exposuimus condemnantes hæreticos universos, quibuscumque nominibus censeantur, facies quidem habentes diversas sed caudas ad invicem colligatas, qui de vanitate conveniunt in id ipsum Damnati vero præsentibus sæcularibus potestatibus aut eorum ballivis relinquantur animadversione debita puniendi, clericis prius a suis ordinibus degradatis, ita quod bona hujusmodi damnatorum, si laici fuerint, confiscentur: si vero clerici, applicentur ecclesiis a quibus stipendia receperunt. Qui autem inventi fuerint sola suspicione notabiles, nisi juxta considerationem suspicionis qualitatemque personæ propriam innocentiam congrua purgatione monstraverint, anathematis gladio feriantur, et usque ad satisfactionem condignam ab omnibus evitentur, ita quod si per annum in excommunicatione perstiterint, ex tunc velut hæretici condemnentur. Moneantur autem et inducantur, et si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam compellantur sæculares potestates, quibuscunque fruantur officiis, ut, sicut reputari cupiunt et haberi fideles, ita pro defensione fidei præstant publice juramentum, quod de terris suæ jurisdictioni subjectis universos hæreticos ab ecclesia denotatos, bona fide pro viribus exterminare studebunt, ita, quodamodo, quandocunque quis fuerit in potestatem sive perpetuam sive temporalem assumptus, hoc teneatur capitulum juramento firmare. Si vero dominus temporalis satisfacere contempserit, significetur hoc summo Pontifici, ut ipse vasallos ab ejus fidelitate denunciet absolutos, et terram

above set forth—condemning all heretics, by whatever names they may be denominated, having indeed different faces, but tails tied together, because they all agree in the same folly. Let these persons, when condemned, be abandoned to the secular authorities being present, or to their officers, in order that they may be duly punished — those who are clergymen being degraded; so that the property of persons thus condemned, if laymen, shall be confiscated, and in the case of clergymen applied to the churches from which they drew their stipends. But let those who are discovered as only notably suspected, unless according to the nature of the suspicion and the quality of the person they show their innocence by a suitable purgation, be struck by the sword of anathema.

* * * *

Let the secular powers, whatever offices they may hold, be advised and instructed, and, if need be, compelled by ecclesiastical censure, and as they desire to be reputed and held faithful, to take a public oath for the defence of the faith, that they will study to the utmost to exterminate from all territories subject to their jurisdiction all heretics so marked by the Church.

* * * *

And if the secular power refuse to comply, let it be told to the Sovereign Pontiff, and let him denounce the subjects as released from their fealty, and give the

exponat Catholicis occupandam, qui eam exterminatis hæreticis, absque ulla contradictione possideant."

"Adjicimis insuper ut quilibet archiepiscopus vel episcopus per se aut per archidiaconum suum aut alias honestas idoneasque personas, bis aut saltem semel in anno propriam parochiam in qua fama fuerit hæreticos habitare, circumeat, et ibi tres vel plures boni testimonii viros, vel etiam, si expedire videbetur, totam viciniam jurare compellat, quod, si quos ibidem hæreticos sciverit, vel aliquos occulta conventicula celebrantes, seu a communi conversatione fidelium vita et moribus dissidentes, eos episcopo studiat indicare."

country to Catholics, who, having exterminated the heretics, may peaceably possess it."

"We add, moreover, that every archbishop or bishop, by himself or by his archdeacons, or other honest and fit persons, should traverse at least once or twice a year every parish in which it is rumoured that heretics reside; and there compel three or four men of good repute, or, if expedient, the whole neighbourhood, to make known to him any heretics, or person holding secret conventicles, or dissenters from the life and manners of the faithful."—Decretal headed Innocent III. in Concilio Generali, vol. ii. p. 758.

Pope Urban II. (anno 1088) says: "Subjects are by no authority constrained to pay the fealty which they have sworn to a Christian prince who opposeth God and his saints." (Corp. Jur. Canon a Petro Pittæo et Francisco, vol. i. Paris, 1695.)

Gregory VII., in depriving Henry, son of the Emperor, said, "It is right that he should be deprived of dignity who doth endeavour to diminish the majesty of Christ." (Plat. in Greg. VII.) And in a Synod at Rome, addressing the holy princes of the Apostles, he says: "If it be your part to judge angels who govern proud princes, what becometh it you to do towards your servants? Put forth this judgment, that all may understand that not casually, but by your means this son of iniquity doth fall from his kingdom."

Gregory II., says Baronius (anno. 730) "did effectually cause both the Romans and Italians to recede from obedience to the Emperor." And Baronius adds, "He did leave to posterity a worthy example

that heretical princes should not be suffered to reign in the Church of Christ."

In the Pope's own canon law it is said—

"Juramentum contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam præstitum non tenet."

"An oath contrary to the utility of the Church is not to be observed."—Vol. ii. p. 358, decret. Greg. IX lib. ii. tit. 24. cap. 27. Leipsic, 1839.

Again, this canon law says—

"Non juramenta sed perjuria potius sunt dicenda quæ contra utilitatem ecclesiasticam attentantur."

"These are to be called perjuries rather than oaths which are attempted against ecclesiastical utility."—Ibid.

"Vos juramento hujusmodi non tenemini quin pro juribus et honoribus ipsius ecclesiæ, ac etiam specialibus vestris legitime defendere et contra ipsum principem stare libere valeatis."

"You are not bound by an oath of this kind, but, on the contrary, you are freely bid God speed in standing up against kings for the rights and honours of that very Church, and even in legislatively defending your own peculiar privileges."—Decret. Greg. IX. lib. ii. tit. 24. cap. 31. vol. ii. p. 360.

"Fidelitatem quam Christiano Principi jurarunt, Deo ejusque sanctis adversanti nulla cohibentur auctoritate persolvere."

"The fealty which subjects have sworn to a Christian king who opposes God and his saints they are not bound by any authority to perform."—Vol. i. p. 648.

St. Liguori, vol viii. p. 137, says—

"Heretici, apostatæ, et schismatici, possunt affici censuris quia per baptismum sunt subjecti ecclesiæ."

"Heretics, apostates, and schismatics may be visited with the censure of the Church, because by baptism they are the subjects of the Church."

"Tenetur Episcopus etiam in locis ubi officium sanctæ Inquisitionis viget, sedulo curare ut creditam sibi diocesim, ab hæreticis purget."

"The bishop is bound, in places where the holy Inquisition flourishes, to purge the diocese committed to him of heretics."—Vol. ix. p. 345.

"Excommunicationem incurrunt etiam hæreticorum credentes, *i.e.* qui eorum erroribus se assentiri, externe manifestant—

"They incur excommunication who show that they assent to the errors of heretics; as if one should say, 'I believe

ut g. si quis dicat, 'Credo quod Calvinus ad vel quod fuit vir sanctus.'" what Calvin says,' or that 'Calvin was a holy man.'" Vol. viii. p. 321.

The 'Tablet, says: "Rome has spoken. England is parcelled out into dioceses, and in future there will be a bishop in every diocese, and a parish priest in every parish. The whole community of baptized persons in the kingdom of England will owe obedience to the Church of Rome under pain of eternal damnation." Truly said. According to the Romish canon law we do owe it; according to our Bibles we do not owe it; according to our Constitution we do not owe it. We have but one head in spiritual things, the Lord of Glory on his throne; and but one Queen supreme in the government of all the subjects of this realm, Queen Victoria, whom God preserve!

The history of the Church of Rome has been the continuous development of her persecuting principles. They were never in abeyance, never obsolete, and they ceased to be carried out only when the power of her opponents was greater than her own. It is no common system, sustained by no ordinary forces, that has made kings tremble on their thrones, nations crouch as ignoble supplicants at her feet, and left her mark ineffaceable on every kingdom of Europe. It is a tremendous power, but it is the power of the Wicked One, not of God. Hers is an inspiration from beneath. But her meridian is past. She wanes over all Europe. The knell of her doom is about to sound, and the ruin that follows will be awful.

Hallam (vol. ii. p. 224) gives a graphic and faithful narrative of the development and eventual supremacy of intolerance, cruelty, and ambition. After touching upon the course of the bishops and clergy of the kingdoms embraced by the Western

Roman Empire, he adds, (ii. 224): "But while the prelates of these nations, each within his respective sphere, were prosecuting their systems of encroachment upon the laity, a new scheme was secretly forming within the bosom of the Church to enthral both that and the temporal governments of the world under an ecclesiastical monarch. Long before the earliest epoch that can be fixed for *modern* history, and indeed, to speak fairly, almost as far back as ecclesiastical testimonies can carry us, the bishops of Rome had been venerated as first in rank among the rulers of the Church. . . . Various causes had a tendency to prevent the bishops of Rome from augmenting their authority in the East. . . . But, within the pale of the Latin Church, every succeeding age enhanced the power and dignity of the Roman See. By the constitution of the Church, such as it had become in the fourth century, its divisions being arranged in conformity with those of the empire, every province ought to have its metropolitan, and every vicariate its ecclesiastical exarch or primate. The bishops of Rome presided in the latter capacity over the Roman vicariate, comprehending Southern Italy and the three chief Mediterranean islands. But it happened none of the ten provinces forming this division had any metropolitan; so that the Popes exercised all metropolitan functions within them, such as the consecration of bishops, the convocation of synods, the ultimate decision of appeals, and many other sorts of authority. . . . It is important to apprehend this distinction of the patriarchate from the primacy of Rome, because it was by extending the boundaries of the former, and by applying the maxims of her administration in the south of Italy to all the Western churches, that she accomplished the first object of her scheme of usurpation, in subverting

the provincial system of government under the metropolitan." (P. 227.) "Pelagius III., A.D. 580, sent a pallium or vest, peculiar to metropolitans, to the bishop of Arles, perpetual vicar of the Roman See in Gaul. Gregory I. had made similar presents to other metropolitans. But it was never supposed that they were obliged to wait for this favour before they received consecration, until a synod of the French and German bishops, held at Frankfort in 742, by Boniface, as legate of Pope Zachary. It was here enacted that, as a token of their willing subjection to the See of Rome, all metropolitans should request the pallium at the hands of the Pope, and obey his lawful commands. This was construed by the Popes to mean a promise of obedience before receiving the pall which was changed in other times by Gregory VII. into an oath of fealty. This Council of Frankfort claims a leading place as an epoch in the history of the Papacy. Several events ensued, chiefly of a political nature, which rapidly elevated that usurpation almost to the greatest height. . . . . About the conclusion of the eighth century there appeared under the name of one Isidore, an unknown person, a collection of ecclesiastical canons, now commonly denominated the False Decretals. These purported to be rescripts or decrees of the early Bishops of Rome, and their effect was to diminish the authority of metropolitans over their suffragans, by establishing an appellate jurisdiction of the Roman See in all causes, and by forbidding national councils to be holden without its consent. Every bishop, according to the Decretals of Isidore, was amenable only to the immediate tribunal of the Pope, by which one of the most ancient rights of the provincial synod was abrogated. Every accused person might not only appeal from an inferior sentence, but remove an

unfinished process before the supreme Pontiff. . . . New sees were not to be erected, nor bishops translated from one see to another, nor their resignation accepted, without the sanction of the Pope. . . . . Upon these spurious decretals was built the great fabric of papal supremacy over the national churches—a fabric which has stood after its foundation crumbled beneath it; for no one has pretended to deny, for the last two centuries, that the imposture is too palpable for any but the most ignorant ages to credit." (Hallam, vol. ii. p. 367.)

"Gregory VII. (1073) completed the destruction of their liberties. The principles contained in the Decretals of Isidore, hostile as they were to ecclesiastical independence, were set aside as insufficient to establish the absolute monarchy of Rome. By a constitution of Alexander II., during whose pontificate Hildebrand himself was considered the effectual Pope, no Bishop in the Catholic Church was permitted to exercise his function until he had received the confirmation of the Holy See; a provision of vast importance, through which, perhaps, beyond any other means, Rome has sustained, and still sustains, her temporal influence as well as her ecclesiastical supremacy. The national churches, long abridged of their liberties by gradual encroachments, now found themselves subject to an undisguised and irresistible despotism." (Hallam, ii. 272.)

The first instance wherein the civil duties of a nation and the rights of a crown appear to have been submitted to his (the Pope's) decision, was in that famous reference as to the deposition of Childeric (750). . . . . "I shall but just glance at the subsequent political revolutions of that period; the invasion of Italy by Pepin; his donation of the exarchate of Ravenna to the holy See; the conquest of Lombardy by Charlemagne; the Patriciate

of Rome conferred upon both these princes; and the revival of the Western empire in the person of the latter. These events had a natural tendency to exalt the Papal supremacy, which it is needless to indicate."

"The principles of ecclesiastical supremacy were readily applied by the Popes to support still more violent usurpations. Chiefs by divine permission of the whole Church, every earthly sovereign must be subject to their interference. The bishops, indeed, had, with the common weapons of their order, kept their own sovereigns in check; and it could not seem any extraordinary stretch in their supreme head to assert an equal prerogative. The first instance where the Roman Pontiffs actually tried the force of their arms against a sovereign, was the excommunication, in the ninth century, of Lothaire, King of Lorraine, and grandson of Louis the Debonair. . . . . And we find both the king and his prelates, who had begun with expressions of passionate contempt towards the Pope, suing humbly for absolution at the feet of Adrian II., successor of Nicholas, which was not granted without difficulty." (Vol. ii. p. 240.)

"Excommunication, whatever opinions may be entertained as to its religious efficacy, was originally nothing more in appearance than the exercise of a right which every society claims—the expulsion of refractory members from its body. No direct temporal disadvantages attended this penalty for several ages; but, as it was the most severe of spiritual censures, and tended to remove the object of it, not only from a participation in religious rights, but in a considerable degree from Christian society, it was used sparingly, and upon the gravest occasions. Gradually as the Church became more powerful and more imperious, excommunications were issued upon

every provocation, rather as a weapon of ecclesiastical warfare than with any regard to its original intention. . . . . Princes who felt the inadequacy of their own laws to secure obedience, called in the assistance of more formidable sanctions. Several capitularies of Charlemagne denounce the penalty of excommunication against incendiaries or deserters from the army. Charles the Bold procured similar censures against his revolted vassals. Thus the boundary between temporal and spiritual offences grew every day less distinct, and the clergy were encouraged to fresh encroachments as they discovered the secret of rendering them successful.

"The civil magistrate ought, undoubtedly, to protect the just rights and lawful jurisdiction of the Church. It is not so evident that he should attach temporal penalties to her censures. Excommunication has never carried such a presumption of moral turpitude as to disable a man, upon any solid principles, from the usual privileges of society. Superstition and tyranny, however, decided otherwise. The support due to Church censures by temporal judges is vaguely declared in the capitularies of Pepin and Charlemagne. It became, in later ages, a more established principle in France and England, and, I presume, in other countries. . . . . These actual penalties were attended by marks of abhorrence and ignominy still more calculated to make an impression on ordinary minds. They were to be shunned like men infected with leprosy, by their servants, their friends, and their families.

"But as excommunication, which attacked only one, and perhaps a hardened sinner, was not always efficacious, the Church had recourse to a more comprehensive punishment. For the offence of a nobleman, she put a county; for that of a prince, his entire kingdom, under an interdict, or suspension of

religious offices. No stretch of her tyranny was, perhaps, so outrageous as this. During an interdict, the churches were closed, the bells silent, the dead unburied, no rite but those of baptism and extreme unction performed.

This was the mainspring of the machinery that the clergy set in motion, the lever by which they moved the world. From the moment that these interdicts and excommunications had been tried, the powers of the earth might be said to have existed only by sufferance.

"The noonday of papal dominion extends from the pontificate of Innocent III. to that of Boniface VIII., or, in other words, through the thirteenth century. Rome inspired during this age all the terror of her ancient name. She was once more the mistress of the world, and kings were her vassals." (Vol. ii. p. 284.)

Robertson, in his 'Life of Charles V.,' p. 122, writes: "As Rome had so long been the seat of empire and the capital of the world, its bishops were on that account entitled to respect, and they received it; but during several ages they received and even claimed nothing more. From these humble beginnings, they advanced with such adventurous and well-directed ambition, that they established a spiritual dominion over the minds and sentiments of men to which all Europe submitted with implicit obedience. Their claims of universal jurisdiction as heads of the Church, and their pretensions to infallibility in their decisions, as successors of St. Peter, are as chimerical as they are repugnant to the genius of the Christian religion. But on these foundations the superstition and credulity of mankind enabled them to erect an amazing superstructure. In all ecclesiastical controversies, their decisions were received as the infallible oracles of truth.

Nor was the plenitude of their power confined solely to what was spiritual; they dethroned monarchs, disposed of crowns, absolved subjects from the obedience due to their sovereigns, and laid kingdoms under interdicts. There was not a state in Europe which had not been disquieted by their ambition; there was not a throne which they had not shaken; nor a prince who did not tremble at their power."

In the decretals we find the fundamental laws of the Church of Rome, and they speak out the spirit of her future deeds in unmistakeable enactments.

"Decret. q. xxiii. v. 42. Pelagius the Pope, the authority of canonical Scripture, and the truth of the rules given by our fathers, teach us that schism is an evil, and that men of this kind must be repressed by external power.

"V. 43. If any one erect another altar, or make a schism, he shall be excommunicated and condemned; and if he despise this, he be crushed by the public power.

"V. 44. Both Divine and human laws have decreed that they who are divided from the unity of the Church, and wickedly disturb its peace, be repressed, even by secular power."

Pelagius was Pope between A.D. 555 and 578, and these decrees show that the practice of excommunicating and delivering over to secular power for condign punishment was then enforced. It is unnecessary to carry our citations down to later dates. We note the recognition by the Roman emperors, that all the churches are subject to the Roman see, and find that see decrees all who are separated from itself, and refuse to join in its worship, shall be excommunicated and crushed by the secular powers. We have only now to add the practice by the Church of these persecuting principles.

The earlier deeds of oppression are buried in the

lapse of time, and fragments only remain to certify what the full body of history might have furnished. Of these we will cite a few instances; but space forbids us doing more. Whilst the later systematic deeds of blood so fully portray the ultimate development of those principles which guided Rome, that we shall be warranted to conclude her early powers to have been exercised in the same direction.

There have been four successive degrees in the cruelties of Rome:—

1. The excommunication.
2. The calling in of the secular arm to burn the excommunicated.
3. Interdicts and crusades by military invasion against whole districts.
4. The Inquisition to carry imprisonment, torture, and death throughout the whole Christian world.

Excommunication, as pronounced by the Church of Rome, was in itself a fearful blow. Its object was declared accursed of God. In the act of excommunication, the curse of the Almighty is launched against the offender, and his candle (representing his life temporal) is extinguished in darkness. All Christians are forbidden to speak to him, or buy or sell, or in any manner deal with him; no Church will admit him; no priest will pray with him; his children cannot be baptized; and if he die his body is denied Christian burial. In Romish countries, during the period when all the world "gave their power to the beast," this sentence was equivalent to banishment; and the only course open to the stricken man was concealment in some distant part where he and his offence were unknown.

The calling in of the secular arm heightened this suffering. The excommunicated was seized as a criminal. His spiritual sentence was considered a

conviction of a high crime against society, for which imprisonment and forfeiture of all his property was the lesser punishment, and burning alive at the stake the full recompense of his iniquity. In this manner the Church of Rome could punish all who dissented from her doctrines or worship, and overwhelm the meekest and most worthy Christians by the most relentless sentence and most excruciating death.

So true is it that the shedding of blood creates a thirst for blood, that the indulgence of these cruelties, instead of exciting the horror of Christendom, led to a more systematic persecution in the form of interdicts and crusades against whole districts or kingdoms. The Pope sent a legate, armed with a bull of excommunication against the devoted country, commanded him to preach a crusade of some neighbouring military power, and commissioned him, after the manner of the Mahometan leaders, to promise eternal glory as the reward of all who fell in the crusade. The country of the proscribed was invaded, men, women, and children indiscriminately massacred, with every aggravation of brutal indignity and outrage; and the invaders ultimately received the blessing of the Pope, and bore on their banners the sign of the cross, as a witness of the glory earned by them in the extirpation of the so called heretics.

We should have thought it impossible for human wickedness to surpass these atrocities, or for delusion to go beyond the dark and deadly credulity which could regard such deeds of wholesale murder and outrage as a service to religion. But the thirst for blood and the fiendish ingenuity of the Romish Church advanced still further.

Faber, in his history of 'The Vallenses and Albigenses,' observes (p. 59): "The firmness of their religious adherence to principle was marked by their frequent and ready submission to martyrdom. Hun-

dreds were burned alive on one large funeral pile; two out of three more earnest presidents were severally stoned and cut in sunder with the axe; and the third, that very remarkable character, Simeon, or Titus, after a full deliberation of three years amidst the honours and pleasures of a court, from a persecutor became a steady convert, appeared as the successor of the very man over whose martyrdom he had presided, and finally submitted himself to the flames, rather than abandon the faith which, by a sacrifice of all his worldly goods and prospects, he had embraced. This happened in the seventh century." (P. 32.)

In the twelfth century (Hallam's 'Middle Ages,' i. 25), Pope Innocent III. despatched commissioners, the seed of the Inquisition, against the Albigenses, and on their being defended by Raymond, Count of Toulouse, preached a crusade against that count and his subjects. "Languedoc, a country for that age flourishing and civilised, was laid waste by these desolaters—her cities burned, her inhabitants swept away by fire and the sword: and this was to punish a fanaticism ten thousand times more innocent than their own. The Albigenses' war commenced with the storming of Baziers, and a massacre wherein fifteen thousand persons, or according to some narratives, sixty thousand, were put to the sword. Not a living soul escaped, as witnesses assure us. It was here that a Cistercian monk who led on the Crusaders answered the inquiry how the Crusaders were to be distinguished from the heretics, '*Kill them all—God will* KNOW HIS OWN!'"

Mr. Baxter, in his very able commentary on the Apocalypse, gives an abridged history of the sufferings of the Waldenses, from a work called 'The Israel of the Alps, translated from the French of Dr. Alexis Muston, by William Hazlitt,' which I here quote.

In 1847 the new Pope fulminated against the

Vaudois a bull of extermination, commanded a crusade, promised forgiveness of sins to the crusaders, authorised them to seize all property found and exterminate the heretics. Eighteen thousand troops, accompanied by a vast band of plunderers, broke in upon the quiet valleys of the Vaudois, in Piedmont. These Christians, however, armed themselves, and after a severe struggle—aided by their mountain fastnesses and the favour of God—beat back their oppressors.

The primitive Christians in the valley of Val Louise of France were reserved for a different fate. The same bull and the same forces which had so failed in Piedmont were launched against these valleys, headed by the Pope's legate, who at once strangled the eighteen prisoners he first took. The inhabitants of the valley hid themselves in a vast cave on the nearly perpendicular side of a mountain nearly six thousand feet above the plain. But here the enemy followed them; and after slaying those who came to the mouth of the cavern, heaped burning fagots at the entrance, and suffocated all the rest. More than three thousand Vaudois perished here; among them were four hundred infants in their cradles, or in the arms of their dead mothers. The Pope had the fiendish triumph of murdering, in cold blood, three thousand unoffending Christians, and of inciting eighteen thousand Romanists to incur the guilt of their murder. ('Israel,' &c. 13.)

Other valleys of the French Vaudois escaped. Of these Louis XII., after judicial inquiry, pronounced "These worthy people are better Christians than we." But against them and their followers in France and Piedmont, between 1056 and 1290, no fewer than five Papal bulls were launched, demanding their extirpation ('Israel,' &c. 22.) In 1550 the fanatical troops were excited by the Pope's legate to assault

the Christians in Merindol and Cabicere, in Provence; and in their work of extermination these troops burned all the buildings, treated the women with every brutality, and afterwards slew all the captured, making again more than 3,000 victims. Te Deums were celebrated in the Romish churches for this success. ('Israel,' &c. 37.)

A colony of Vaudois had emigrated to Calabria, where their industrious habits and quiet demeanour gained them the esteem of all. From 1340 to 1558, they dwelt in peace; but in 1559, the preaching of a young and zealous pastor having excited public notice, he, with a fellow pastor, was seized and transported to the dungeons of the Inquisition at Rome. His fellow was severely tortured, and afterwards burned alive. He himself was examined for four days, after which he was taken to the castle of St. Angelo, and there strangled, and his body burnt in the presence of Pope Pius IV. A persecution commenced in Calabria: the Vaudois leaders were horribly tortured, to induce a confession of crimes they never committed. One was pressed in torture until his bowels gushed out; another was kept for eight consecutive hours under a torture called *hell*; another, stripped naked, was gashed with iron whips, and beaten to death; whilst one of his sons was flayed alive, and another thrown from a high tower, before his eyes. Another victim thus thrown down, but not killed, was eaten alive by swine; women *enceinte* were burnt alive. About 1,600 victims died under their persecutors, and the colony was wholly broken up.

The persecutions continued by the Church of Rome drew, every year, victims to the fagots; but, in 1655, under the preaching and intrigues of the Propaganda, a systematic effort was organised, for annihilating the Vaudois, and an army of 15,000

men were directed against them. Their commander, by bad faith and treachery, obtained possession of several places, in all of which he burned the houses, and outraged and slew all the inhabitants.

A series of engagements ensued, in which the Vaudois were generally victorious; but relying too much on the treacherous promises of their enemies, and attacked on every point by an overwhelming force, they sustained the conflict with great losses, until upon the mediation of England and other Protestant states, a treaty was concluded, by which the remnant were permitted to dwell for a time in peace. The atrocities, however, committed in this attack, and the treachery of the Popish leaders, filled Europe with indignation, and drew forth from the English Protector, Oliver Cromwell, strong and cutting remonstrances, both to the sovereign of Savoy and the King of France. These massacres were cruel beyond all precedent. Young children were dashed to pieces against the rocks; sick persons burned alive in their houses; men and women stripped, flayed alive, bound hand and foot, and cast over precipices; women and girls outraged, impaled on pikes, and left to die, or roasted at a slow fire; others were buried alive. Monks and priests assisted and burned down the houses. Fathers were compelled to see their children cut to pieces, after being outraged. Eyes were torn from the head, nails from the fingers, the heart and lungs cut out alive. In several communes not a cottage was left standing.

In 1685, the year after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the rulers of France and Savoy, swayed by the skilful influence of the priests and inquisitors, concentrated upon the Vaudois valleys their combined troops, with the view of rooting out all heresy. They induced the greater part of the people to lay down their arms, on promise of safety and protection,

and then killed them in cold blood, and re-enacted all the horrors of the massacre of 1655. No hope of life remained to any of the Vaudois save in exile, and the surviving remnant to the number of 2,656, found shelter in the republic of Geneva. These were all who remained of 15,000, more than 12,000 having been sacrificed to the fanatical cruelty of Rome.

In 1689 these noble exiles fought their way back, through the forces of France and Savoy, to their native valleys; and after maintaining themselves for eight months, a rupture between Savoy and France led to a peace which recognised their permanent settlement, and though persecution continued at intervals, the good providence of God has ever since protected them.

The character and acts of that masterpiece of cruelty, the Inquisition, may be gathered from Llorente, a Roman Catholic writer, and himself Secretary to the Inquisition (the English translation of whose works was published in 1826). In writing the history of the Inquisition he gives some prefatory observations on the early practice of persecution by the Church of Rome. After showing that the Apostles and early fathers were averse to oppressive measures against heretics, and citing instances in which, down to the reign of the Emperor Constantine, heretics were reconciled and admitted again into the bosom of the Church, he cites the decree of the sentence of death by the Emperor Theodosius against the Manichæans in 382, in fact authorising the system of Inquisition; the practice of severe penal punishments for heresy was gradually introduced into the Church. In 633 the Council of Toledo passed such decrees against the Jews, which were in later years increased in severity. In 811, when the Emperor Michael had condemned the Manichæans to death, and the patriarch Nicephorus entreated him to use more

gentle means, he observes: "The spirit of the Church was so far from moderation that the abbot Theophanes, celebrated for his piety, does not hesitate to speak of Nicephorus as ignorant and ill advised; and adds, that the maxims of Holy Writ warrant the custom of burning heretics, because they can never be brought to repent." (P. 8.)

These maxims were strengthened by the spirit of the crusades, which in the eleventh and twelfth centuries took possession of the mind of Europe. In 1181, the Bishop of Alva was sent into France to pursue the war against the Albigenses; and the success of the expedition not being complete, a new Council was held, at which the bishops were recommended in their visitations to require the nobles and other inhabitants to take an oath to discover heretics, and punish them by excommunication and forfeiture. This act shadowed forth *the Inquisition*, which in 1203 was fully initiated by a commission from the Pope to preach against the Albigenses, and enlarged in the following years by powers to prosecute and destroy, and to incite crusades by promises of pardon and indulgences.

In A.D. 1203 the Inquisition was formed into a regular institution, and armed with fearful powers. It consisted of a grand inquisitor-general, with many high officers, and an extensive police. In its cells were carried out refined and excruciating systems of torture, which the Roman Catholic Llorente shrinks from describing. Haydn, in his 'Dictionary of Dates,' under the head of *Inquisition*, states: "At the destruction of the Inquisition of Spain in 1809 there were found machines used in the prison of every kind which the ingenuity of man could invent. The first was a machine by which the victim was confined, and then, beginning with the fingers, every joint in the hands, arms, and body, was broken or drawn one

after another until the victim died. The second was a box, in which the head and neck of the victim were so closely confined by a screw that he could not move in any way. Over the box was a vessel in which one drop of water a second fell upon the head of the victim; every successive drop, falling on precisely the same place on the head, suspended the circulation in a short time, and put the sufferer in the most excruciating agony. The third was an infernal machine, laid horizontally, to which the victim was bound, the machine then being placed between two beams in which were scores of knives: by turning the machine with a crank the flesh of the sufferer was torn from his limbs, all in small pieces. Besides these dreadful instruments of torture there were others too shocking to describe." Llorente describes another of these machines, as found in 1820 at Madrid, under which a prisoner was to have been executed on the day following the opening of his prison. "The condemned is fastened in a groove upon a table on his back; suspended above him is a pendulum, the edge of which is sharp, and it is so constructed as to become longer with every movement. The wretch sees this instrument of destruction swinging to and fro above him, and every moment the keen edge approaching nearer and nearer. At length it cuts the skin of his nose, and gradually cuts in until life is extinct."

The procedure of the Inquisition is horrible. The victim is seized on the strength of a private accusation, which he neither hears nor sees. He is denied all communication with his friends. He is examined by the inquisitors, and every answer is taken down. The inquisitors urge him to confess his crime. He is subjected to torture more or less horrible, according to the caprice of his judges. If he survive, and the Inquisition judge him guilty, he is condemned without

proof or open trial, and is handed over to the secular power to be burnt alive. Should he repent, he has the mercy of being strangled before he is burnt. (Llorente, 59 &c.)

Llorente describes the case of a married lady of high rank. She was seized by the Inquisition when six months gone with child. She was delivered in prison, and at the end of eight days her child was taken from her. "It fortunately happened that she had as companion in her cell a young girl, who was afterwards burnt as a Lutheran, and who, pitying her situation, treated her with the utmost kindness during her convalescence. She (the girl) soon required the same care. She was tortured and all her limbs were bruised and almost dislocated. Jane (the lady) attended her in this dreadful state. Jane was not quite recovered when she was tortured in the same manner. The cords with which her still feeble limbs were bound penetrated to the bone, and several blood-vessels breaking in her body, torrents of blood flowed from her mouth. She was taken back to her dungeon in a dying state, and expired a few days after." Yet after all this, the inquisitors publicly declared this lady, whom they had so murdered, to be innocent! Llorente, Romanist as he is, cannot avoid adding: "Under what an overwhelming responsibility will these monsters appear before the tribunal of the Almighty!"

The torture so alluded to as practised on those ladies consisted in stripping the victim and passing cords round and round the fleshy parts of their arms and thighs in many folds. The ends of these cords were attached to levers, which being bent, tightened the cord so that very slight trouble to the tormentors cut through the skin and flesh to the bone.

Llorente details more especially the acts of the Inquisition in Spain, to which he was the secretary.

He gives numberless instances of persecution, perfidy, and cruelty, and charges the Inquisition with the ruin of Spain, and with "arresting the progress of arts, science, industry, and commerce;" and states, besides driving out a million of industrious inhabitants, it immolated "*on its flaming shambles more than* 300,000 *victims.*"

What the Inquisition accomplished in Spain may be taken as an example of its procedure in all the Roman Catholic kingdoms in which it was established. Limborch's 'History of the Inquisition' traces its rise and progress in Aragon, France, Tholouse, and Italy (p. 77, &c.), at Venice (p. 94); in Valence, Flanders, and Artois (p. 118); Portugal, Naples, Sicily, Sardinia, Milan, Germany, and the Low Countries (pp. 131-160). It was used to torture and destroy true saints throughout Christendom. It crushed the Reformation in Spain.

The marriage of a king was supposed to be appropriately honoured by the spectacle of victims being brought out to be burned alive; and the young Queen of Spain was welcomed to the throne by the exhibition of 118 victims of the Inquisition, of whom 19 were burned alive in her presence. (Llorente, 513.) Such is the spirit, and such the social state of a nation taught by Popery.

Limborch relates that on the preaching of John Wickliffe in England, in 1377, the Pope sent his bulls to the University of Oxford, to the Archbishop of Canterbury and Bishop of London, and also to King Edward, commanding that Wickliffe should be seized and imprisoned in irons, and proceeded against "even to the condemnation he had deserved;" and some time after, on the death of Wickliffe, the then king commanded all his writings to be burned. (P. 114.)

In 1396 the Pope exhorted the King of England

against the Lollards; and the Archbishop of Canterbury and the apostolic Legate held a Synod in London, and proceeded with great severity, and committed many of the Lollards to the flames. (P. 115.)

In 1408 the doctrines of Wickliffe, carried into Bohemia, were defended by Huss. Huss, continuing to preach them, was summoned before the Council of Constance, with a safe-conduct from the Emperor. The Council, having condemned the writings of Wickliffe, seized Huss, and he was burned alive at the stake.

Jerome of Prague was also similarly condemned and burnt. (P. 116.) In 1422 the Inquisition was established in Bohemia, and the followers of Huss were hunted down: "Some were burned alive, others thrown into the river, tied hands and feet, and so drowned, and others destroyed by different methods of cruelty." (P. 117.)

M'Crie, 'Reformation in Italy,' p. 161, gives a letter of a Roman Catholic, writing to his master, containing an account of one of these scenes. "I have now to inform you of the dreadful justice which began to be executed on these Lutherans early this morning. To tell you the truth, I can compare it to nothing but the slaughter of so many sheep. They were all shut up in one house, as in a sheepfold. The executioner went, and bringing out one of them, covered his face with a napkin, led him out to a field near the house, and causing him to kneel down, cut his throat with a knife; then taking off the bloody napkin, he went and brought out another, whom he put to death in the same manner. In this way the whole number, amounting to eighty-eight men, were butchered. I leave you to figure to yourself the lamentable spectacle, for I can scarce refrain from tears while I write. Nor was there any person, who, after witnessing the execution of one, could stand to look on

a second. The meekness and patience with which they went to martyrdom and death are incredible. Some of them at their death professed themselves of the same faith with us, but the greater part died in their cursed obstinacy. All the old men met with their death with cheerfulness, but the young exhibited symptoms of fear . . . Even to-day a decree has passed that a hundred grown-up women shall be put to the question (tortured), and afterwards executed."

"But it is time," writes M'Crie, "to bring this distressing part of the narrative to a close; suffice it to say, that during the whole of this century (the sixteenth) the prisons of the Inquisition in Italy, particularly in Rome, were filled with victims, including prisoners of noble birth, male and female, men of letters, and mechanics. Multitudes were condemned to penance, to the galleys, or other arbitrary punishments, and from time to time individuals were put to death."

In the Low Countries, where the Protestant faith had been adopted, persecution raged. The Duke of Alva, in 1573, boasted he had slain 18,000 heretics by the hands of the executioner, besides all who perished in the war of extermination which he waged against them. Above 120,000 forsook their country to escape death.

The Reformation in France extended throughout the whole country, and embraced nobles as well as the common people. Out of a population of 15,000,000, not less than 1,000,000 were Protestants. In 1535 the King issued a proclamation against the heretics, and multitudes were seized and burned alive. "As if the ordinary horrors of the stake were inadequate, these martyrs, bound to the extremity of long poles, were alternately lowered to, and withdrawn from, the blazing pile, till the ropes with which they were fastened caught fire, snapped

asunder, and plunged their already half-burned limbs into the devouring flames." (Smedly, 'History of Reformed Religion in France,' vi. 31.)

In 1562, under the sanction of the Duke of Guise, an unarmed reformed congregation at Vassy were attacked by the soldiers, and sixty lives sacrificed, the dead bodies were stripped, and the alms-chest plundered. (Smedly, 223.)

Civil war raged in France, but on its conclusion by a peace promising protection to the reformed, the treaty was broken; and in 1568, excited by the preaching of the Romish priests, the population were roused to fury. "At Amiens, more than a hundred Huguenots perished in a tumult. On the restoration of Auxerre to the Royalists, a massacre of the reformed commenced, and a hundred and fifty corpses were thrown into the sewers and the river. Rouen, Bourges, Issondun, Trois, Blois, and Orleans witnessed outrages which terminated in wholesale murder." (Smedly, i. 309.)

These sanguinary scenes were crowned in the massacre of St. Bartholomew, in 1572. The king, having arranged a marriage of the reformed king of Navarre with his own daughter, induced the renowned Admiral Coligny, and the Prince of Condé, and the other leaders of the Protestants, to attend the ceremony. A few days after the ceremony he surrounded them with his body-guard, and at the sound of the tocsin on the morning of St. Bartholomew, the Protestants were murdered in cold blood. The king incited his soldiers and the populace of Paris to slay the Huguenots. The Reformers were everywhere hunted down, and slain with the most merciless cruelty. Thirty thousand perished, besides those who fled from death into exile. (Smedly, ii. 21.)

The brutality of the king and court exceeded all

belief; the transports of the clergy were extreme, and the Pope not only welcomed the news of this massacre by illuminations, solemn processions, and Te Deums, but also had a medal struck in perpetuation of his approval, which remains to this day as a monument of the ferocity of Rome. This medal was sent me from Rome.

A peace was concluded by the Edict of Nantes, which secured freedom of worship, and was "the charter of the reformed Gallican Church during the remainder of its existence."

The Pope and clergy of Rome did not cease to plot against it. The Huguenots were harassed by petty exactions, but still protected till the end of the seventeenth century. Louis XIV. renewed persecution. Dragoons were quartered on the Huguenots, and they committed every excess. In 1685 the king, under the teaching of his confessor, revoked the Edict of Nantes, banished the Huguenot ministers, razed to the ground their places of worship, and prohibited their congregations, under the severest penalties, from assembling. This act "covered all France with dismay, and deprived the king of half a million of his best subjects." (Smedly, iii. 267.)

Truly Rome is drunk with the blood of saints! Assuming the name of the meek and lowly Jesus, she has indulged in cruelty, intolerance, and bloodshed, and made the earth an Aceldema, not a garden of the Lord.

Can this system last much longer? Impossible. Its destruction cannot tarry.

X.

HOSTILE TO SCIENCE.

THERE are no doubt some things which Romanism does patronise, and it is but fair and candid to admit this. She has been a great patroness of painting, music, and splendid architecture during a long period of her history. Why? Painting, and architecture, and music have nothing in them essentially and inevitably either Protestant or Popish. They may decorate the one or the other with equal facility of application. The Church of Rome is an institution adorned to the very utmost, and for a very natural and obvious reason, inasmuch as ornament is necessary in order to conceal from ordinary eyes the radical defects of a corrupt and anti-Christian system. But all the painting that can be applied will never conceal from the Christian mind the dense and numerous errors of her creed, though it may conceal it from those who do not value or estimate religion by its inherent and real elements. To paint the rose, or to adorn the lily, or to gild refined gold, or to add fresh perfume to the violet, seems an excess of supererogation. Pure religion needs no ornaments or art to adorn it—the least adorned, it is adorned the most. It is always a suspicious sign when we see a church, whether Protestant or Romish, beginning to add to the splendour of her

communion-table or to the gorgeous colours of her windows; for, although it may seem uncharitable, it is natural to fear that the minister is conscious of the inner glory making its exodus, and is now trying to lay on the outer glory in order to fill up the wide chasm it has left behind.

The Church of Rome has been a great patroness of music in every age, and in her churches upon the Continent we may hear the performance of some of the most magnificent compositions, though one still feels that the Psalmist's strain upon a people's lips has something in its mighty mass more thrilling and significant, nobler and richer, than the sound of organs, and flutes, and sackbuts, and psalteries.

The Church of Rome has been a great patroness of architecture, but it has been at the expense of many other more precious acquisitions. From the ninth to the twelfth centuries of the Christian era the noblest cathedrals in Europe were raised, while the great mass of the people were sunk in the deepest degradation, and when Hildebrand was putting his foot upon the necks of kings, and kindling a war of devastation and rapine throughout Europe. It does not require a man to be a very great Christian in order to build a cathedral. It is possible to be a very magnificent architect and yet a very indifferent Christian. It is possible to build a gorgeous temple, as Herod did, and yet to live and die as Herod lived and died. The whole earth is one vast cathedral: ruined cities are its broken tablets, and the histories of ancient nations, the inscriptions still legible, and grass, and sand, and rock are its tesselated pavements, wind, and wave, and thunder its everlasting anthem, and its high altar is the Son of God; every stone in it is eloquent with praise, and everything contained in it preaches a sermon to the listening and consecrated ear.

But whatever the Church of Rome has done for architecture, painting, and music, she has never been a patroness of science at any era of her history, or in any part of the world under her dominion. The late Cardinal Wiseman published a lecture 'On the Relation of the Arts of Design to the Arts of Production,' and among other things he said that Bernard Palissy, "after sixteen years' perseverance, produced the first specimens of coloured and beautiful pottery, such as are to this day sought after by the curious, and he received a situation in the king's household, and ended his days in comfort and respectability." But what were the actual facts of the case? In Morley's 'Life of Palissy, the Potter,' it is stated that "Palissy, the great potter, died in 1589 in the Bastile, where he had been confined for four years as a Huguenot (that is, because he was a Protestant); the king and his other friends could defer his trial, but dared not grant him liberty." The assertion of Dr. Wiseman is rather contradicted by Feller and Henrion, both Jesuit priests, who state in the 'Dictionnaire Historique:' "*Palissy (Bernard de) né dans le diocèse d'Agen, potier de terre, était au-dessus de son état par son esprit et ses connaissances. Il naquit au commencement du 16me siècle et mourut, vers* 1589, *en prison, pour avoir embrassé et répandu de Calvinisme. Ayant appris de lui-même l'arpentage, qui fut sa première profession, il s'appliqua ensuite au dessin, voyagea pour étudier l'histoire naturelle et surtout la chimie, fort peu connue de son temps. Il fit plusieurs expériences, dont quelques-unes réussirent. En* 1543, *il fut chargé de lever la carte des marais salants de la Saintonge. Après* 16 *ans de peines et d'expériences, il parvint à découvrir la composition d'émail, ce qui lui mérita d'être appelé à Paris et d'avoir un logement au Louvre, où il fit ouvrir, en* 1575, *un cours d'histoire naturelle. Il échappa à la*

Saint-Barthélemy; mais, quelque temps après, les ligneurs le firent mettre en prison comme Calviniste." The late Cardinal alleged that Palissy lived a life of competency and ease, and died under the patronage of that Church which always had fostered science and art; but on his statement being sifted, it turns out that Palissy died a prisoner in the Bastile, where he had been confined for his Protestant opinions and his love of his Bible.

But the boast of Dr. Wiseman is found in the following sentence:—"Science has nowhere flourished more, or originated more sublime and useful discoveries, than where it has been pursued under the influence of the Roman Catholic religion." After hearing this, one would expect to find great scientific productiveness in Spain, in Italy, in Austria, in Ireland, and among the Romish population of England. One would expect to find that the two Sicilies had exceeded the two Saxonies, that Spain had eclipsed Holland, and that Italy outshines England. Are these Roman Catholic countries very productive of Newtons, of Keplers, and of Davys; or are theirs so modest as to "blush unseen, and waste their sweetness on the desert air?" There are indeed scientific incidents and achievements in the Breviary we do not profess to equal. One genius, some hundred years ago, crossed the Mediterranean on his cloak. Where has Protestantism such early acquaintance with hydraulics and hydrostatics as this? Hide your heads, ye Wattses and Ericssens, and ye Atlantic steamers, in the presence of this talented, economical, and scientific genius in the Romish Church. Another Roman Catholic *savant*, recorded in the Breviary, had his head cut off in battle. He did not stick it on again—that would have been an ordinary exploit—but he took his head under his arm, and marched home with a counte-

nance as composed as if nothing had happened. The Church of Rome has two heads of John the Baptist, one in Rome and the other at Amiens; but this is scientifically explained—one was the head of John the Baptist when he was a boy, and the other when he was of middle age! Such are some scientific phenomena recorded in the Breviary. The Church of Rome possesses as many fragments of the true cross as, if collected together, would build one of Her Majesty's 120-gun ships. The eyes of Madonnas are constantly winking, and often shedding tears, and the blood of St. Januarius liquefies on the day dedicated to his service. In such scientific accomplishments as these Protestants confess their inferiority, and acknowledge that Romanists have the pre-eminence.

Dr. Cullen, chief bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland, has stated his belief that the earth stands still, and the sun, moon, and stars are so courteous that they make a daily march round the earth instead of giving the earth the trouble to march round them. This is Dr. Cullen's version of the Syllabus. A French priest the other day enunciated the wonderful discovery that railroads have been sent as a special judgment on hotel-keepers for providing their guests with flesh-meat during Lent. This is another specimen of profound Romish science. In the great metropolis of Christendom—in Rome, where there are no heretics to disturb the happy and peaceful serenity of the mother Church, as the fountain of all accomplished and scientific discoveries, gaslights have not been long introduced, and when railroads were first proposed to be carried into the holy city, the Pope sank into his sacred slippers in perfect horror at the very idea of it, and only at last consented on learning that the project would be carried out with English money. It is very curious that if the Church of

Rome is so great a patroness of science its city should continue so little indebted to its products or so superior to its discoveries. The one great metropolis of the world which is in all the comforts and conveniences resulting from science a century behind all is Rome. Spectacles, Dr. Wiseman asserts, were invented by Armati, an Italian banker; whereas the truth is, they were only improved by Armati, and were long before invented by a foreigner. The discovery of the barometer he attributes to Torricelli. Let Torricelli have the credit of it; but was that discovery made under the auspices of the Roman hierarchy, or with their approbation? Did his genius expand under the fostering influence of the Romish priesthood? Not at all. It is stated in the life of that illustrious man, that no sooner did the priesthood hear of his discovery, and the just and scientific grounds on which he explained it, than they fell foul of him and furiously attacked him for daring to contradict an infallible, and, as they said, a Catholic truth, that "Nature abhors a vacuum;" and that the reason why air rushes into an exhausted lung, why water rises in the tube of the pump, and why mercury rises and sinks in the barometer, is that Nature had an abhorrence of a vacuum. Nature must thus have appeared to these monastic patrons of science sensitively squeamish, fond of a crowd, and averse to quiet. Torricelli explained the principle of his barometer on very different grounds, and when he did so he met with the violent opposition of the priests of the Romish Church. But when Cardinal Wiseman ascribed electricity to Galvani and Volta he eclipsed himself. He said Galvani and Volta were the great discoverers of electricity. Volta and Galvani discovered some peculiar manifestations of the action of electricity; but as a science it had no formal and

real shape until Davy, Oersted, Biot, and Faraday took it in hand, and before their day Franklin and a few others. He might as well have ascribed steamboats and locomotives to Tubal Cain. But when Cardinal Wiseman touched astronomy he went beyond all besides. When he referred to Galileo he seemed to soar beyond himself, and to rise to the third heaven; but it was on waxen wings, and his fall was the more terrible in the ratio of the height to which he so indiscreetly rose. He has transubstantiated a sufferer at the hands of the Vatican into one of the indigenous products of the holy Catholic Church. In short, he reads history backwards; he pronounces fact to be fiction.

Galileo's history was a ceaseless conflict with a bigoted, intolerant, and superstitious priesthood. His discovery of the absurdity of the Aristotelian philosophy, the founder of which occupied a place second only to the Pope's, led him to attack that inveterate system; and for doing that very thing, as an essential preliminary to sound scientific inquiry, Nizzoli, who flourished nearly fifty years before, was persecuted; and Geordane Bruno, nearly a cotemporary, was burned at Rome for doing what Galileo once more ventured to attempt. It was the republic at Venice—not the college of cardinals—who first provided Galileo with a situation as professor in Padua and a suitable stipend. Such information on magnetism as Galileo possessed he owned to have derived from Dr. Gilbert, an Englishman, whose work 'De Magnete' he exceedingly admired. It was on a visit to a friend at Venice, in 1609, that he heard that a Dutchman, Hans Lippersheim, had invented an optical instrument which had the singular property of causing distant objects to appear near. This Dutchman had a telescope made by himself in October, 1608. Fucarius stated that one of these tele-

scopes had been sent to Florence long before Galileo's was made; and Sirturus states that a Frenchman, a partner of the Dutch inventor, came to Milan in May, 1609, and offered a telescope for sale to the Count de Fuentes. It was stated by Sir David Brewster that Galileo was not the inventor of the telescope, and a more competent scientific judge could not be quoted than Sir David. Telescopes were invented in the Protestant country of Holland, and thus one of the cardinal claims, that Galileo invented the telescope, is disposed of. So unpopular were Galileo's discoveries of the satellites of Jupiter, that the principal professor in Padua resisted his entreaties to look through his telescope, and argued from analogy that what Galileo saw was impossible. When Galileo brought his telescope to Rome, some of the cardinals were alarmed; but being the wonder of the age, out of curiosity alone to see so talented a man, they did not resist his arrival. Sir David Brewster observes: "The Aristotelian philosophers, the temporising Jesuits, the political churchmen, entered into an alliance against Galileo, and threatened him with the penalties of his scientific discovery." In 1613, Galileo having addressed a letter to the Popish abbé, Costelli, stating that the Bible was not designed to teach science and philosophy, and that the language of the Scriptures was to be interpreted in its common interpretation, Caccini, a Dominican friar, ascended the pulpit and took for his text what he thought in itself a splendid argument against Galileo,—"Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye here looking up into heaven?" It is but fair to state, however, that Maraffi, the general of the Dominicans, expressed his regret, while he indicated the extent of the opposition, by saying he could not be responsible for the conduct of forty thousand brutal monks.

How was Galileo further treated under the auspices of a Church said to be the patroness of science? He was summoned to appear at Rome in the year 1615, and cited before the Inquisition to answer for the heretical doctrines which he had published. He was charged with maintaining the motion of the earth and the stability of the sun. On the 25th of February, 1615, it was decreed that Galileo should be enjoined by Cardinal Bellarmine to renounce his obnoxious doctrines, and to pledge himself neither to teach them in public nor to defend them in future. In the event of his refusal to acquiesce in this sentence, it was decreed that he should be thrown into prison.

Professor Playfair has observed: "The Church itself was roused into action by reflecting that it had staked the infallibility of its judgments on the truth of the very opinions which were now in danger of being overthrown. Thus was formed a vast combination of men not very scrupulous about the means which they used to annoy their adversaries; the power was entirely in their hands, and there was nothing but truth and reason to be opposed to it. . . . It determined to silence by force an adversary who could not be put down by argument.

"His dialogues contained a full exposition of the evidence of the earth's motion, and set forth the errors of the old, as well as the discoveries of the new philosophy, with great force of reasoning, and with the charms of the most lively eloquence. They are written, indeed, with such singular felicity that one reads them at the present day, when the truths contained in them are known and admitted, with all the delight of novelty, and feels one's self carried back to the period when the telescope was first directed to the heavens, and when the earth's motion, with all its train of consequences, was proved for the

first time. The author of such a work could not be forgiven. Galileo, accordingly, was twice brought before the Inquisition.

"The first time, a council of seven cardinals pronounced a sentence which, for the sake of those disposed to believe that power can subdue truth, ought never to be forgotten:—'That to maintain the sun to be immovable, and without local motion, in the centre of the world, is an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, heretical in religion, and contrary to the testimony of Scripture. That it is equally absurd and false in philosophy to assert that the earth is not immovable in the centre of the world, and considered theologically, equally erroneous, and heretical.'

"These seven theologians might think themselves officially entitled to decide what was heretical or orthodox in faith; but that they should determine what was true or false in philosophy, was an insolent invasion of a territory into which they had no right to enter, and is a proof how ready men are to suppose themselves wise, merely because they happen to be powerful.

"At this time a promise was extorted from Galileo that he would not teach the doctrine of the earth's motion, either by speaking or by writing. To this promise he did not conform. His third dialogue, published though not till long afterwards, contained such a full display of the beauty and simplicity of the new system, and such an exposure of the inconsistencies of Ptolemy and Tycho, as completed the triumph of Copernicus.

"In the year 1663, Galileo, now seventy years old, being brought before the Inquisition, was forced solemnly to disavow his belief in the earth's motion; and condemned to perpetual imprisonment, though the sentence was afterwards mitigated, and he was

allowed to return to Florence. The Court of Rome was very careful to publish this second recantation all over Europe, thinking, no doubt, that it was administering a complete antidote to the belief of the Copernican system. The sentence, indeed, appears to have pressed very heavily on Galileo's mind, and he never afterwards either talked or wrote on the subject of astronomy. Such was the triumph of his enemies, on whom ample vengeance would have long ago been executed, if the indignation and contempt of posterity could reach the mansions of the dead."

His libel, as given by Limborch, is:—

"Whereas you, Galileus, of Florence, aged seventy, were informed against in the year 1615, in this holy office, for maintaining as true a certain false doctrine held by many, viz., that the sun is the centre of the world, and immovable, and that the earth moves round it with a daily motion. Likewise, that you have certain scholars to whom you have taught the same doctrine. Likewise, that you have kept up a correspondence with certain German mathematicians concerning the same. Likewise, that you have published certain letters concerning the solar spots, in which you have explained the same doctrine as true, and that you have answered the objections which, in several places, were made against you, from the authority of the Holy Scriptures, by construing or glossing over the said Scriptures, according to your own opinions. And, finally, whereas the copy of a writing, under the form of a letter, reported to have been written by you to one who was formerly your scholar, has been shown to us, in which you have followed the hypothesis of Copernicus, which contains certain propositions contrary to the true sense and authority of the Holy Scriptures.

"Now, this holy tribunal, being desirous to provide against the inconveniences and dangers which

this statement may occasion, to the detriment of the holy faith, by the command of the most eminent lords, cardinals, &c., of this supreme and universal Inquisition, have caused the two following propositions concerning the immovability of the sun, and the motion of the earth, to be thus qualified by the divines, viz.—

"That the sun is the centre of the world, and immovable, with a local motion, is an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and absolutely heretical, because it is expressly contrary to the Holy Scriptures.

"That the earth is neither the centre of the world nor immovable, but that it possesses a daily motion, is likewise an absurd proposition, false in philosophy, and theologically considered, at least erroneous in point of faith.

"But, as it pleased us in the first instance to proceed kindly with you, it was decreed in the said congregation, held before our lord N., Feb. 25, anno 1616, that the most eminent lord cardinal Bellarmine should command you that you should entirely depart from the said false doctrine, and in case you should refuse to obey him, that you should be commanded by the commissary of the holy office to abandon the same, and that you should neither teach it to others, defend it, nor say anything concerning it, and that if you should not submit to this order, you should be put in gaol," &c., &c.

After a long account of the errors of Galileo's writings, their condemnation of the same, and their dealings with the unhappy author in order to his recantation, the holy fathers proceed as follows:—

"Invoking, therefore, the most holy name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of his most glorious mother, Mary, ever a virgin, we do, by this our definitive sentence, which, sitting in our tribunal, we pronounce

in these writings with the advice and judgment of the reverend masters, doctors of divinity and both laws, with whom we have consulted concerning the cause and causes now depending before us, between the magnificent Carolus Sincerus, doctor of both laws and procurator of the exchequer of this holy office of the one part, and you, Galileus Galilei, a criminal here, under the power of the Inquisition, by this present written process, examined and confessed as above, of the other part; we do say, judge, and declare that you, the aforesaid Galileus, have upon account of those things which are produced in the written process, and which you have confessed as above, subjected yourself to a strong suspicion of heresy in this holy office, by believing and holding to be true a doctrine which is false and contrary to the sacred and divine Scripture, viz., that the sun is the centre of the orb of the earth, and does not move from the east to the west; and that the earth moves, and is not the centre of the world; and that these things may be considered and defended as probable opinions, although they have been declared and determined to be contrary to the sacred Scripture; and, consequently, that you have incurred all the censures and penalties appointed and promulgated by the sacred canons, and other general and particular acts against such offenders; from which it is our pleasure that you should be absolved, provided that you do first, with a sincere heart, and a true faith, abjure, curse, and detest, before us, the aforesaid errors, and heresies, and every other error and heresy contrary to the Catholic and apostolic Roman Church, in the form which shall be prescribed to you by us.'

In order to arrest the progress of science and the discoveries it was introducing, and in order to do so effectually, they inserted in the 'Index' Galileo's

letters to Castelli, and to the Grand Duchess of Tuscany, Kepler's epitome of the Copernican theory, and the work of Copernicus on the revolution of the heavenly bodies. That the conduct of Galileo was otherwise correct, and his orthodoxy otherwise pure was attested by Pope Urban VIII., in a letter to the Grand Duke of Tuscany, containing the following words: "We find in him the love of piety; we have willed to give him this honourable testimony of virtue and piety." Galileo not ceasing to teach the new theory, Urban VIII. referred his work to the Inquisition. Old and sick, the philosopher was dragged to Rome, again condemned to be imprisoned by the holy tribunal of the Inquisition during its pleasure. To escape being burned, which would have been his doom, he laid his hand on the holy Gospels—he did that which nothing could justify—and abjured and detested his deliberate convictions, and vowed never again to teach the doctrine of the earth's motion and of the sun's stability.

Is it therefore true that Galileo either discovered his problems, or was able to elucidate or institute his discoveries under the fostering patronage of a Pope, the Inquisition, the cardinals, bishops, or priests of that day? Such is the love of science in the bosom of the Romish Church, that, ecclesiastically considered, Galileo died as a prisoner of the Inquisition, and that horrible tribunal doubted his right to make a will, and whether he could be buried in consecrated ground; and, though a large sum was subscribed for erecting a monument to him in the church Santa Croce, the Pope would not allow the design to be carried out, and his remains were buried in an obscure nook of the church, and were thirty years without a tablet. Cardinal Wiseman says, Galileo suffered for his religion, and not for his scientific opinions. Were that the fact it would only

more deeply and darkly brand the Romish Church; for by the mouth of one of her prominent bishops she is charged with inflicting penal judgments, imprisonment, and deprivation of Christian burial on men for holding certain religious sentiments, and even after renunciation for the error of reading God's Word and inferring its meaning. The cardinal thus relieves his Church from the charge of proscribing science, by branding her with the more terrible crime of crushing liberty and conscience and true religion. Both charges can be substantiated against her, but in this case—the case of Galileo—it was not Protestantism, but science; not a religious truth, but a scientific fact that Rome denounced, and by the mouth of some of her sons denounces even to this day. The monks and inquisitors were perfectly indifferent to science and religion too. Only any fact disclosed by the one, or doctrine educed from the great formularies of the other that threatened, or could be construed to disturb, the domination and supremacy of the Vatican, Pope, and prelate, and inquisitor, and monk, hunted down without mercy, and at any risk. Statuary and painting Rome always encouraged. These are parts of her service, the decorations of her system; essential, in order to conceal its errors, and to add to its alien but attractive glories. In these there is scarcely any possibility of embodying heresy. Protestants do not require for their sanctuaries painters and statuaries, in order to possess a scripture character or a traditional martyr; the one is not necessarily hostile to Romanism, and the other positively allied. Destitute of the inner spiritual and moral glory; exhausted of vital and growing strength; dependent on earthly and material resources, Romanism gathers round her all that can charm the vulgar, propitiate the tasteful, and awaken admiration, even if at the

expense of holy, and saving, and sanctifying feeling. Like the ancient Egyptian temples, the creeping things of the Nile may be the gods within, but all the resources of artistic genius are combined in giving grandeur and magnificence without. Italy, in spite of Popery, is beautiful; and were it not for the repressive power of the Popedom, its modern would eclipse its ancient glory. Its soil and its sun are splendid; its antecedents and traditional glories are sufficient to stir colder hearts than those that beat in Italian bosoms.

Why do not Romanists mention Dante, Petrarch, Ariosto, Tasso? It might remind the reader that in the fourteenth century Rome had not a single copy of Homer, and that Petrarch was overwhelmed with joy on receiving one from the Greeks. It might remind them of Petrarch's sonnet—

> *"Fontana di dolore, albergo d'ira,*
> *Scola d'errori, e tempio d'heresia,*
> *Gia Roma, hor Babilonia, falsa e ria,*
> *Per cui tanto piange e si sopira;*
> *O fucina d'inganni, o prigion d'ira*
> *Ovi a buon muore et i mal si nutre e cria;*
> *Di vivi inferno! un gran miracolo sia*
> *Se Christo teco al fine non s'adira."*

"Fountain of grief, abode of anger, school of errors, and temple of heresy: formerly Rome, now Babylon, false and guilty, through whom there are so many tears and sighs; mistress of deceit, of prisons of wrath, where the good perish and the bad are cherished and engendered; hell of the living! it will be a great marvel if Christ is not angry with thee at last." (Petr., Part I., Son. 108., p. 149; vol. iv. Basil, 1581.)

> "See Rome, proud mistress of the world no more,
> But loudly thundering against heathen lore;
> Her gray-haired synods damning books unread,
> And Bacon trembling for his brazen head:

"See graceless Venus to a virgin turned,
And Phidias broken, and Apollos burned;
A second deluge learning thus o'erran,
And the monks finished what the Goths began."

But it must not be forgotten, that almost all the discoveries in science quoted as the growth of Italy under Romish patronage, occurred subsequent to the glorious Reformation. Is not this suggestive evidence? M. Biot, in his announcement of the third volume of the great work of Laplace, confirms all I have said, and seems to regard the Reformation as the true parent of progress in scientific knowledge. He says: "About two hundred years ago a man of genius, for having discovered and collected the incontestable proofs of the motion of the earth, was condemned as a heretic to perpetual imprisonment by a court of the Inquisition. Now, a complete treatise on the celestial motions is published without restraint. Its illustrious author beholds the sciences honoured in his person by the first dignitaries of the state—how much progress in so short a time, and how vast a space gone over since the days of Galileo!" This admission by an illustrious man of science implies that ascendant Romanism is hostile to science, and that the same glorious event that opened the Bible led forth imprisoned science also. It was under the protecting wings of the Reformation that the Keplers, the Newtons, the Laplaces, the Faradays, and others, had been able to pursue their investigations. Wherever the Reformation has spread, the apparatus of censures, the indices, and the Inquisition have disappeared. Reason has taken the place of force; discussion has dislodged inquisition; and men think and study, and give forth the results, satisfied with the patronage of a fair, full, and ample opportunity.

Thus we see how many of the discoveries in

science claimed for Italian Romanists disappear and dissolve in clearer light, and how very defective must be the scientific triumphs of Rome, since such are her chiefest, if not her only proofs. But the truth is, Italy never received from Romanism anything but degradation, imprisonment, proscription, and misery. To ascribe to the influence of Romanism whatever genius has struck out or research disclosed, in the Italian peninsula, is as absurd as to attribute to the influence of Protestantism the Papal aggression. There are sunshine and balmy air in Italy, and vineyards and hills clothed with lovely vegetation to their summits, but Italy, not Romanism, is the parent of all this beauty. There are magnificent remains of statuary and architecture and ancient art, yet not the popes but the Cæsars have any credit for them. The few scientific men that dared to show themselves in Italy arose like scattered tall trees amid swamps and an undergrowth of noxious vegetation, indicating that inherent, indomitable vitality and force which no hostile elements could repress. Fevrier and Jacques, two French commentators on Sir Isaac Newton, even so late as 1742, prefixed to his 'Principia' this declaration: "Newton assumed in this book the hypothesis of the earth's motion. The proposition of that author could not be explained otherwise than by making the same hypothesis. Hence we have been forced to admit a character not our own. But we declare our submission to the decrees directed by the Romish pontiffs against the motion of the earth." But I will carry the Cardinal to an epoch and a social condition when Rome had it all her own way.

From the sixth to the sixteenth century Romanism was in the ascendant, its power was absolute, heresy of any kind barely disturbed it. Surely, then, these ages, all moving under the influence of the Tiara,

were ages of unrivalled glory, and Europe was a garden of wondrous and beautiful creations? Alas! human nature never sank lower; with respect to religion, and scientific and literary pursuits, the atmosphere was never so thick. "The dark ages" is a feeble description of that state of things. Hildebrand, in a letter to the Abbot of Cluny: says, "The Romans among whom I dwell are worse than Jews and Pagans." King Alfred complained that there was not a priest from the Humber to the Thames who understood the liturgy in his mother tongue, or who could translate the easiest piece of Latin; and that from the Thames to the sea, ecclesiastics were, if possible, more ignorant. Hallam says that contracts were verbal, because no one could be found learned enough to draw up charters. Leo X. issued the most severe prohibitions against books translated from Greek, Hebrew, or Arabic. Learning was all but quenched in places co-extensive with the jurisdiction of Popedom and the spread and influence of the Romish faith. It was the Greek monks—schismatics in the judgment of Rome—who repudiated the pretensions of the Popedom, who transcribed Homer and Plato in their cells; and it was schismatic Greek scholars that fled towards Italy on the fall of Constantinople; who rekindled the lights of literature in dark, degenerate, and priestridden Italy. The last retreats of knowledge and literature were not in Italy, nor in Spain, nor within the limits of the Western Church, but amid the heights of Athos, the peaks of Metesra, the caves of Arcadia; and if the schismatic Greek Church had not nursed the learning that the barbarous priesthood of Rome trod out, Italy, and Spain, and England had probably sunk as low as Egypt and Babylon and Nineveh. Most assuredly a Newton, a Franklin, a Locke, a Shakespeare, a Milton, never would have emerged out of the stagnant

swamps, and amid the priest-infected air of the religion of Hildebrand. During these dark ages, the Mohamedan in the East was far more enlightened than the Romanist; caliphs could have instructed cardinals, and Arabs, Romans. Mahomedanism sheltered what the Church of Rome persecuted and proscribed. Dante and Petrarch composed their works in exile; Bocaccio bitterly complains of the persecution of which he was the victim; Machiavelli was persecuted by the Medici; Guiccardini wrote his history in voluntary, yet in inevitable banishment; Ariosto lived in beggary; Tasso died in despair and want. Yet these celebrated men were so treated under the fostering care of Romanism. The Inquisition of Cologne obtained an imperial edict to burn all Hebrew books; and one of them, Hochshaten, offered to prove that the study of Greek as well as Hebrew was pernicious to its faith. Even the faculty of theology at Paris declared that religion was ruined if the study of Greek and Hebrew was permitted. The words of a mendicant monk, as given by Cönrad, of Heresbach, are: "They have invented a new language, which they call Greek. You must be carefully on your guard against it; it is the mother of all heresy. I see in the hands of men a book written in that language, which they call the New Testament: it is full of daggers and poison. As to the Hebrew, it is certain that all those who learn it become Jews."

Further, the Church of Rome has drawn up indices, and has put in the 'Index' some of the noblest works which have proceeded from the pen of man. The religious writings of Protestants we may, of course, expect to be there. But not merely the religious, but the ethical and literary productions of Protestant authors are proscribed. Among those are all the modern authors of eminence. In

theology—Wycliffe, Luther, Calvin, Sherlock, Tillotson, Fisher, Whitby, Prideaux, and Michaelis; in scholarship—Scaliger, Campanella, Savanarola, Fleury, Lightfoot, Dupin, Bayle, Cudworth; among the historians—Hallam, Robertson, Hume, Burnett, Maimebourg, Mosheim, Merle d'Aubigné. The only historian she has left out is the infidel, Gibbon. Why is not Gibbon there? Is it because Infidelity and Romanism—like sin and death, as seen by the poet Milton—at first thought they were the most distant, hostile persons; but when they come together to compare notes, they find they are intimately related to each other? While infidelity was at the bottom of the excesses which were committed in 1793, it may be discovered at the last day that Voltaire, Rousseau, and others of that stamp were the guilty but unfortunate victims of a teaching with which the Jesuits had imbued the mind from its earliest and most susceptible moments. In this 'Index' are also included the philosophers—Bacon, Bentham, Malebranche, Leibnitz, Condorcet, Hobbes, Locke, Kant, Reid. Among the defenders of Christianity put in the 'Index' are Addison and Grotius; Newton, and the astronomers; and Dante, Milton, and Béranger among the poets; there is scarcely a celebrated poet or literary character we cannot find there. Grant an old priest at Rome—not always the wisest—the power of prohibiting the circulation of any work that crosses his prejudices, his preferences, and his passions, and it is impossible that science can flourish under the influence of the Roman Catholic religion. It is recorded that a printer, who had once printed a heretical book, had all the books he printed condemned. In a work of Ignatius Loyola, edited by Cardinal Wiseman, we read: "If the Church decree to be black what you see white you are bound to

believe it black." This prostration of the intellect, this extinction of personality, and absorption in Rome, is fatal to all intellectual and scientific progress. The celebrated Niebuhr, a competent and impartial judge, writing from Rome, September 24, 1816, says: "I have been acquainted with two or three literary men of real ability; but they are old men, who have only a few years to live; and when they are gone Italy will be, as they say themselves, in a state of barbarism." On the 30th of October, 1818, he wrote: "Rome is a terrible place for any one who is melancholy, because it contains no living person present to relieve the sense of sadness. The present is revolting; there are not even any remains of the cloud of the Middle Ages. There is only one man of talent and mental activity here—an old ex-Jesuit, on the borders of the grave, and he repeats the verdict which I have already heard—*Italia spenta e un corpo morto;* which means, 'Italy is exhausted, and has become a dead corpse.'" In May, 1819, he wrote: "Learning and literature are at a lower ebb than, perhaps, in any other country."

But, were the Church of Rome the most illustrious patron of science, this would be no proof of its Apostolic and Scriptural character. The Hindoos are distinguished for scientific attainments; but Hindooism is still wrong. The Chinese make such attainments a passport to office; yet the doctrines of Confucius are not, therefore, to be considered right. Fallen angels know more than Faraday and other scientific men; but they are fallen angels still. Let it never be forgotten that knowledge, science, and literature are mere power; but the knowledge of God and of his Son is everlasting peace. The boy that knows of no other curve than that generated by trundling his hoop, may be a

better Christian than he who is profoundly versed in the laws and nature of cycloidal curves.

Where civil freedom is swallowed up by ecclesiastical despotism; where the Pope is also prince, and a camarilla of cardinals his only parliament; where infallibility pronounces its decisions; where there is a religion that crushes free inquiry, and fears the light; where discussion is suppressed and the Syllabus rules; and free conclusions of the intellect may be punished with confiscation of goods, imprisonment, and death—there science must perish, and literature wither, and the Middle Ages become the normal condition of mankind. In the recent Syllabus of the Pope liberty of conscience and freedom of the press are denounced as detestable errors. In this great land, and under the auspices of our Queen—our constitutional sovereign—opinion is free as air; talent is not only allowed but welcomed into the field of competition; there is an audience for anyone who has aught to say; there is a patronage for literature and science far more precious than Popes ever offered—the patronage of a fair opportunity to all.

If I may venture to unfold the venerable auspices of my native land, or to cast its great horoscope in that sky in which so many nations have waxed and waned; if I may inquire whether its streets shall be trod, and its fields sown, and its looms worked, and its arts and sciences and literature upheld by a people worthy to speak the tongue of Milton, and to inherit the renown of Newton, whether we shall continue the loyal supporters of a throne still rooted as the granite rock, and the loving subjects of a Queen fair as the flower that blooms on it, I must first ascertain the depth, and fervour, and spring of its Protestant Christianity. Is it drawn pure from the Bible? Thanks be to God for that blessed

book. Let no Romanist darken its glorious light; let not a shadow come between it and us. I enter the sanctuary a prodigal, but a penitent prodigal, seeking my Father's face; and there, in its sacred pages, instead of reading preparations to punish me, I find a joyous festival; and instead of rebukes, I hear ringing from the skies—"This my son was lost and is found, was dead and is alive again." This blessed book tells me that the fires of Sinai are quenched, and the sword returned to the scabbard; and the cherubim, that once bade me off from the gates of Eden, are now ministering spirits to the heirs of salvation.

This religion will endure for ever.

That of Rome withers and dies daily, and the Œcumenical Council will hasten, not impede its end.

XI.

THE QUARRELS OF THE FATHERS.

By *the Fathers* are meant certain divines who flourished during the first five centuries, though Romanists say twelve centuries, in order to include St. Bernard. Dr. Delahogue, on the authority of Eusebius, states that the Fathers who were really most fitted to be the luminaries of the age in which they lived, were too busy in preparing their flocks for martyrdom to commit anything to writing; and therefore, by the admission of this Roman Catholic divine, we have not the full and fair exponent of the views of all the Fathers of the earlier centuries, but only of those who were most ambitious of literary distinction, and least attentive to their charges. The most devoted and pious of the Fathers were busy teaching their flocks; the more vain and ambitious occupied their time in preparing treatises. If all the Fathers of each age had committed their sentiments to writing, we might then have had a fair representation of the theology of the Church of the Fathers; but as only a few have done so, and these not the most devoted and spiritually-minded, I contend that it is unjust to judge of the theology of the early centuries by the writing of the few Fathers who are its only surviving representatives.

But those called the Fathers are not strictly and

properly the Fathers at all. The advantage taken by the advocates of their writings as exponents of primitive theology, is this—that these are the men who lived near the Apostles, and are covered with the hoar of a thousand years; and that it becomes us, the mere youths and striplings of a day, to defer to the grey hairs, and reverence the experience of a remote and venerable age. Now I contend that the gifted divines of the present age are the true fathers of the Christian Church; and that Augustine, and Jerome, and Chrysostom were, in comparison, but the beardless boys of the Christian dispensation. My reason for this strange, and apparently to a Roman Catholic extravagant assertion, is, I think, a very just one. The great majority of the Fathers, probably nine-tenths of them, never saw an apostle. Twenty or two hundred years after the death of an apostle, are about equal, in as far as the knowledge of his views is concerned. What do we know of Martin Luther, after the lapse of three hundred years, except what we gather from his written and accredited biography? What more did our fathers know of him a hundred years ago? How much do we know of John Wesley, except from his writings? Scarcely anything; and a person living a thousand years hence will be just as likely to understand and estimate properly the character of that remarkable man, as a person living only a hundred years after his death. The length of the intervening period makes little difference, if there is no personal contact with the individual. The Fathers had the same Bible that we have, the same eyes, the same judgments, the same promise of the Holy Spirit to guide them; up to this point we are perfectly on a par. What, then, is the point of difference between them and us? It is this; we have, in addition, all the biblical criticism, the physical illustrations, the phi-

losophical facts, the historical evidence, which have been accumulated by an induction of seventeen centuries. All the advantage, therefore, is on our side, as interpreters of the Bible; and I contend that, *à priori*, Matthew Henry and Scott are more likely to be sound expositors of Scripture than the most illustrious of the Fathers. And I am prepared to demonstrate, by reference to the documentary evidence, that in the Commentaries of Henry and Scott, in the sermons of Robert Hall and Bradley, Hare, Chalmers, Dr. Sumner, Dr. McNeill, Mr. Ryle, and other divines in the present age, we have more luminous expositions of Christian theology than in the splendid orations of the golden-mouthed Chrysostom, or in the evangelical comments of Augustine, or in the more acrimonious and voluminous discussions of Jerome. I do not mean to say that there is nothing good in the Fathers; quite the reverse. In the Homilies of Chrysostom there are some of the most exquisite gems of Christian theology, an eloquence the most fervid, the impress of a genius the most glowing; feelings the most earnest and intense, the powers of reasoning which would do credit to the most gifted divine of the age in which we live. In Augustine, also, the most orthodox of the Fathers, there is much evangelical and vital religion, much that may refresh and edify the mind of any reader. In Jerome, though notorious for controversial bitterness, there is no little powerful and eloquent writing. But when I have made all these admissions, I contend, without being guilty of a foolish and rather popular idolatry of the nineteenth century, that they are no more to be compared with the leading divines of the age in which we live, than the schoolmen of the dark ages with Lord Bacon, Sir Isaac Newton, and other philosophers who flourished since the era of inductive philosophy.

I intend to show that the Fathers are contradictory expositors of Scripture; that they are superstitious and fanatical commentators upon Scripture; that they are not trustworthy commentators; and that the position of the Roman Catholic Church, as announced in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., is impracticable and untenable—"Nor will I ever take and interpret the Holy Scriptures otherwise than according to the *unanimous* consent of the Fathers."

One would suppose, that if there be a part of Scripture on which all interpreters would be unanimous, and to which the Romish pre-requisite of patristic unanimity is applicable, it would be the Lord's Prayer; in short, that one meaning would pervade the commentaries upon every clause. I will give the conflicting opinions of the Fathers upon it, as collected by Bellarmine.

The first clause is, "Our Father, who art in heaven." Every one knows perfectly well what that means. But Cyril, Ambrose, and Augustine understand "heaven" to mean the souls of all believers; Gregory, Nyssen, Chrysostom, and the monk Bernard hold that "heaven" means literally heaven. Now here are three Fathers against three, on the interpretation of the very first clause of the Lord's Prayer.

"Hallowed be thy name." Tertullian and Cyprian say this means, "May we persevere in holiness;" and Cyril, Chrysostom, and Jerome say it means, "May God's name be glorified." Here so many Fathers take one opinion, and so many precisely the opposite.

"Thy kingdom come." Ambrose says this means exclusively and only the kingdom of grace. Tertullian, Cyprian, and Augustine say it means the kingdom of glory, and not the kingdom of grace at all.

"Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Tertullian and Augustine say, "heaven" means the spirit, and "earth" means the flesh; Cyprian says "heaven" means the faithful, and "earth" means unbelievers; and the other Fathers say that "heaven" means just heaven, and "earth" means just earth. Now here, again, are two Fathers for the first, one for the second, and the rest for the third and totally distinct opinion. Are these "unanimous" interpreters of the meaning of God's word?

"Give us this day our daily bread." Chrysostom says this means our bodily nourishment. Jerome, Ambrose, and Cyril say that it means only our spiritual nourishment.

"Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us." Tertullian, Cyprian, Gregory, Nyssen, understand this to be, that all, both sinners and saints, need forgiveness. Augustine holds that it means, Forgive us our *venial* sins only, but not our mortal sins. Chrysostom holds, that even after baptism it denotes that there is a place for penance and for indulgence. Now, observe, here are three different interpretations of the same passage, and each maintained by equally illustrious Fathers of the Christian Church.

"Lead us not into temptation." Hilary and Jerome differ a little from Tertullian, Cyprian, and Chrysostom, with respect to this clause.

"Deliver us from evil." Gregory, Nyssen, Cyril, Chrysostom, Theophylact, and all the Greek Fathers hold that this means, "Deliver us from Satan;" but Cyprian and Augustine and all the Latin Fathers hold that it means, "Deliver us from evil in general."

Such is the exposition of the Lord's Prayer in the writings of the Fathers. It proves, that if you expect unanimity in the interpretation of the plainest

portions of Scripture by the Fathers, you expect that which is not to be found.

We read in Genesis iv. 23: "I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt." Upon this text, in the Douay Bible, there is the following note: "It is the tradition of the Hebrews, that Lamech, in hunting, slew Cain, mistaking him for a wild beast; and that having discovered what he had done, he beat so unmercifully the youth by whom he was led into the mistake, that he died of the blows." In the fourth century, Pope Damasus wrote to Jerome, requesting him to impart to him the meaning of certain passages of Holy Writ, and of the above passage among the rest. Pope Damasus' letter is published with Jerome's works. Jerome in his reply says: "Methusael begat Lamech, who being the seventh from Adam, not spontaneously, as it is written in a certain Hebrew book, slew Cain, as he afterwards confesses: 'For I have slain a man to my wounding,'"&c. Thus Jerome adopts the Hebrew tradition, and believes that Lamech slew Cain; and the Douay expositors record the same tradition. When we refer to Chrysostom, we find that he took a very different view of the matter; for he thus interprets the meaning of God's declaration to Cain (in cap. iv. Gen. Hom. xix.): "Have you feared lest you should be killed? Be of good courage; *that shall not happen.* For he who does this shall expose himself to a sevenfold penalty." If we refer to Augustine, we find him quite at variance with Jerome, for he compares the mark set upon the Jews, and their *preservation*, with the mark set upon Cain, and his *preservation*;" and the comparison could not have been justly instituted, if Cain had been slain by Lamech. Augustine's words are as follows (Enarr. in Psalm xxxix.): "For Cain, the elder brother, who slew the younger brother, received a mark, 'lest any man should slay

him,' as it is written in Genesis, God placed a mark upon Cain, that nobody should slay him. Therefore, the Jewish nation itself remains. Cain has not been slain; he has not been slain, he has his mark." If we consult Basil (Epist. 260, class 2), we find that he expressly refers to the tradition that Lamech slew Cain, and affirms that it was *not* true. "Some think that Cain was slain by Lamech, as if he had lived until that time in order that he might yield a longer punishment; but it is not true." Here are authorities against authorities among the Fathers; and yet the Roman Catholic is never to interpret Scripture "except according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." As that unanimity does not exist upon the two passages of Scripture I have quoted, every Roman Catholic is bound, on his own principles, to attach no meaning to them at all, and every Protestant to pause before he receives implicitly patristic expositions.

There is another passage, which the Roman Catholic Church has made very much of, as defensive of the doctrine of Purgatory, but which, upon the then principles, must be discarded altogether, as utterly incapable of any interpretation at all. 1 Corinthians iii. "According to the grace of God that is given to me, as a wise master builder, I have laid the foundation, and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation, gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble, every man's work shall be manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire, and the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is. If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward; if any man's work

shall be burned, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." Cardinal Bellarmine gives us the difficulties of this passage, and the differences of the Fathers:

"The difficulties of this passage are *five* in number, 1. What is to be understood by the builders? 2. What is to be understood by gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble? 3. What is to be understood by the day of the Lord? 4. What is to be understood by the fire, of which it is said, that in the day of the Lord it shall prove every man's work? 5. What is to be understood by the fire, of which it is said, he shall be saved, yet so as by fire? *When these things are explained, the passage will be clear.*

"The first difficulty, therefore, is, Who are the architects who build upon the foundation? The blessed Augustine, in his book on Faith and Works, c. 16, and in his Enchiridion, c. 6, and elsewhere, thinks that all Christians are here called by the Apostles architects, and that all build upon the foundation of the faith either good or bad works. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Œcumenius appear to me to teach the same upon this passage. Many others teach that only the doctors and preachers of the Gospel are here called architects by the Apostle. Jerome insinuates this in his second book against Jovinianus. The blessed Anselm and the blessed Thomas hold the same opinion on this passage, although they do not reject the former opinion. Many more moderns think the same, as Dionysius the Carthusian, Lyra, Cajetan, and others.

"The other difficulty is rather more serious, for there are *six* opinions. Some, by the name of foundation, understand a true but an ill-digested faith; by the name of gold, silver, and precious stones, good works; by the names of wood, hay, and stubble, mortal sins. Thus Chrysostom upon this

place, who is followed by Theophylact. The *second* opinion is, that Christ, or the preaching of the faith, is to be understood by the name of foundation; that by the names of gold, silver, precious stones, are to be understood Catholic expositions, as the commentary of Ambrose and even Jerome seem to teach. The *third* opinion, by the name foundation understands living faith; and by the name of gold, silver, and precious stones, understands works of supererogation, &c. Thus the blessed Augustine, in his book on Faith and Works, lib. vi. The *fourth* opinion is that of those who explain by gold, silver, &c., to be meant good works; by hay, stubble, &c., venial sins. Thus the blessed Gregory, in the fourth book of his Dialogues, c. 39, and others. The *fifth* is the opinion of those who understand by gold, silver, &c., good hearers; and by stubble, &c., bad hearers. Thus Theodoret and Œcumenius. The *sixth* opinion, which we prefer to all, is that by the name of foundation is to be understood, Christ as preached by the first preachers; by the name of gold, silver, &c., is to be understood the useful doctrine of the other preachers, who teach those who now received the faith; but by the name of wood, hay, &c., is to be understood the doctrine, not indeed heretical, or bad, but singular, of those preachers who preach catholically to the Catholic people, without the fruit and usefulness which God requires.

"The *third* difficulty regards the day of the Lord. *Some* understand by the name of day the present life, or the time of tribulation. Thus Augustine, in his book of Faith and Works, c. 16, and Gregory, in the fourth book of his Dialogues, c. 39. . . . . But all the *ancients* seem to have understood by that day the day of the last judgment, as Theodoret, Theophylact, Anselm, and others.

"The *fourth* difficulty is, what is the fire, which

in the day of the Lord shall prove every man's work? *Some* understand the tribulations of this life, as Augustine and Gregory, in the places noted; but these we have already rejected. *Some* understand eternal fire; but that cannot be, for fire shall not try the building of gold and silver. . . . . *Some* understand it to be the pains of purgatory; but that cannot be truly said. First, because the fire of purgatory does not prove the works of those who build gold and silver; but the fire of which we are speaking shall prove every man's work what it is. Secondly, the Apostle clearly makes a distinction between the works and the workmen, and says, Concerning the fire, that it shall burn the works, but not the workers; for he says: 'If any one's work shall remain, and if any work shall burn;' but the fire of purgatory, which is a real fire, cannot burn works, which are transitory actions, and have already passed. Lastly, it would follow that all men, even the most holy, would pass through the fire of purgatory, and be saved by fire, for all are to pass through the fire of which we are speaking. But that all are to pass through the fire of purgatory, and be saved by fire, is clearly false, for the Apostle here openly says, that only those who build wood and hay are to be saved as if by fire; the Church, also, has always been persuaded, that holy martyrs, and infants dying after baptism, are presently received into heaven without any passage through fire, as the Council of Florence teaches in its last session. It remains, therefore, that we should say, that the Apostle here speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, which is not a purging or punishing fire, but one that probes and examines. Thus Ambrose explains it on Psalm cxviii., and also Sedulius.

"The *fifth* and last difficulty is, What is to be understood by the fire, when he says, 'But he shall

be saved, yet so as by fire?' *Some* understand the tribulations of this life; but this cannot be properly said, because then even he who built gold and silver would be saved by fire. Wherefore Augustine and Gregory, who are the authors of this opinion, when they were not satisfied with it, proposed another, of which we shall speak by-and-by. *Some* understand it to be *eternal* fire, as Chrysostom and Theophylact. But this we have already refuted. *Others* understand the fire of the conflagration of the world. It is therefore the common opinion of theologians, that by the name of this fire is to be understood some purgatorial and temporal fire, to which, after death, those are adjudged who are found in their trial to have built wood, hay, and stubble."

Here is another proof of the worthlessness of the comments of the Fathers as infallible expositors, and the utter contradictory absurdity of that vow which every Roman Catholic makes that he will not interpret Scripture unless "according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." Should a Roman Catholic urge the doctrine of Purgatory, building it on this passage, we must ask him if he is not bound by the laws of his Church, first to ascertain that the Fathers are unanimous upon it; and if it be the fact that the Fathers are at issue about its meaning, he must shut his mouth, and not dare to determine and declare the meaning of the passage.

If you dispute with a Roman Catholic, Who is the chief bishop, and what is the true Church? he will tell you, Peter is the rock and the foundation on which the Church rests: and he will quote the words, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church." I do not here discuss what is the true meaning of this passage, but whether the Fathers shed light on it, and whether a Roman Catholic is at all warranted to interpret it. If the Fathers are una-

nimous in the interpretation of it, the Roman Catholic is bound to take that interpretation; but if they are not unanimous, he is bound to put no interpretation on it at all. Let us hear what the Fathers say. Some of them say that the rock is Peter's faith; as Cyril of Alexandria (Dial. 4, on Holy Trin.): "He called nothing but the firm and immovable *faith* of the disciple the rock upon which the Church was founded without the possibility of falling;" and thus also Chrysostom (Serm. de Pent.): "He did not say, upon Peter, for he did not found his Church upon a man, but upon *faith*. What, therefore, is meant by 'upon this rock?' Upon the *confession* contained in his words." Also (Chrys. Serm. 54, on Matt.): "'And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church;' that is to say, upon the *faith* of the confession." Augustine sometimes interprets the rock to mean Peter, and sometimes to mean Christ; and referring to his contradictions in his 'Book of Retractations,' he leaves the reader to choose for himself whichever of the interpretations he prefers. His words are the following (Retract., lib 1.): "I have said, in a certain passage respecting the Apostle Peter, that the Church is founded upon him as upon a rock. . . . But I know that I have frequently afterwards so expressed myself that the phrase, 'upon this rock,' should be understood to be the rock which Peter confessed. For it was not said to him, Thou art Petra; but, Thou art Petrus, for the rock was Christ. Let the reader *select* which of these two opinions he deems the most probable."

On the same passage Roman Catholics build the position, that Peter had an absolute supremacy among the Apostles, and therefore, that he was the first Pope of Rome, the present Pope being his lineal and legitimate successor. But Cyprian denies that Peter

had any successor. He says (De Unit. Eccles.): "The other Apostles were the same as Peter, *endowed with an equal fellowship both of honour and power* (pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatio), but the beginning proceeded from unity, that the Church of Christ might be shown to be one."

Let us turn to the passage, "Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose sins ye retain, they are retained." Protestants maintain that this is a *ministerial and declarative* absolution; Roman Catholics, that it is *judicial*; and that the priest forgives exactly as if he were God. Upon this passage of Scripture, however, Chrysostom expresses himself in terms which agree with the decree of the Council of Trent; while Augustine, in opposition to the Donatists, who claimed this priestly power, maintains that the act is merely ministerial. For he says (Contra Epist. Parmeniania, lib. 2), "That passage in the Gospel, 'As my Father hath sent me, so also do I send you; when he had said this he breathed upon them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost; if ye forgive any one's sins, they shall be forgiven; and if ye retain any one's sins, they shall be retained,' would be against us, so that we should be compelled to confess that this was done *by* men, and not *through* men, if after he had said, 'And I also send you,' he had immediately added, 'Whose sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whose sins ye retain, they shall be retained.' But since the words are introduced, 'When he had said this, he breathed upon them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost,' and then was conferred *through* them either the remission or retention of sins, it is sufficiently shown that *they themselves* did not act, but the Holy Spirit *through* them; as he says in another place, 'It is not ye that speak, but the Holy Spirit who is in you.'" In opposition to this interpretation of Augustine's, the Council of

Trent decrees, that the priest forgives sins judicially, and not ministerially; and therefore the Church of Rome, in this instance, interprets Scripture inconsistently with the opinion of one of the most distinguished of the Fathers.

We read in John v. 30: "Search the Scriptures." In the Roman Catholic version it is, "Ye search the Scriptures;" and as the Greek verb is the same in the indicative as in the imperative mood, they may be warranted in this translation; although I conceive it makes no difference; for the passage, even in the indicative, implies Divine acquiescence in the propriety of the practice; either way it proves the duty of searching the Scriptures. Cyril of Alexandria agrees with the Church of Rome, in considering that the passage is declarative and does not contain a command to search the Scriptures; but Chrysostom says, in his fortieth Homily on St. John's Gospel: "He did not say, *read* the Scriptures, but *search* the Scriptures, since the things that are said of him require much research. For this reason he *commands* (κελεύει) them to search with diligence that they may discover the things which lie deep."

One more passage; Matthew v. 25: "Agree with thine adversary quickly." Jerome is of opinion that the adversary is the brother who is offended, but he mentions that *others* held that the devil was the adversary (*alii juxta epistolam Petri dicentis, adversarius vester diabolus,*" &c.). Bellarmine informs us (c. iv. De Purgatorio, lib. 1), that "*some* by the adversary understand the devil, as Origen (Hom. 35, on Luke), Ambrose, Euthymius, and Theophylact (in cap. xii. Lucæ), and Jerome (in Epist. 8 ad Demet.). *Others* understand by the adversary the flesh; but these are justly refuted by Augustine. *Others* by the adversary understand the Spirit, which the flesh is commanded to obey; but Jerome refutes

this. *Others* by the adversary understand sin; thus Ambrose; this is not probable. *Others* by the adversary understand another man that has injured us; or whom we have injured; thus Hilary, Anselm, and Jerome (on Matt. v.). The truest exposition is, that the adversary is the law of God, or God himself. Thus Ambrose, Anselm, and Augustine, Gregory, and Bernard."

These instances will suffice to show that the vow of the Roman Catholic, "never to interpret Holy Scripture otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers," is precisely equivalent to removing the Scriptures from the use of the clergy and laity together, or making them a dead letter. Roman Catholic divines have accused the advocates of the Protestant Church of making false or disingenuous statements, when it has been alleged that the Scriptures are practically withheld from the perusal of the people; and I admit that in the nineteenth century, amid the light and the privileges of England, the Scriptures in English are, with certain limitations and under licence, allowed by priests to the laity; but it is giving them a book with a padlock upon it, of which the priest holds the key; it is telling them to drink of a fountain, over the mouth of which is a stone they are unable to roll away; it is giving the Scriptures to the eye, but withholding the Scriptures from the understanding. Suppose a Roman Catholic labourer, from the bogs of Ireland, is told and taught not to interpret a chapter of God's blessed book, till he has found "the unanimous consent of the Fathers" upon it. I refer him to the passage, —"Search the Scriptures;" he says to me, "That passage may have a meaning which you and I know nothing of; I must ascertain the 'unanimous consent of the Fathers' before I put any meaning upon

it at all." He goes to the British Museum, tells the Librarian his vow, and requests to be furnished with the writings of the Fathers. To his surprise, some hundred folio volumes are brought to him, being the Benedictine edition of the ancient Fathers. He opens a volume, and is amazed to find it written in Latin or Greek, of either of which languages he never learned a word in his life. But supposing (what is very improbable) he masters the Greek and Latin languages, or is satisfied to take an unauthorised translation, such as is given by the Oxford writers in their edition—and a Roman Catholic may, on the whole, trust an Oxford divine in this matter—suppose, then, that by the aid of an elaborate index he ascertains all the recorded views of the Fathers respecting the passage in question;—he finds that one Father says the text in question is not a command to search the Scriptures; another Father says it is a command, and means you *are* to search them; another says it means something else; and at the close of his laborious and persevering researches, he finds that there is no unanimity on this and other passages, and he must shut up his Bible, and wait for its meaning till the Fathers have become unanimous (which will be "at the Greek calends"), or till Infallibility lays them on its Procrustes' bed and makes them so.

I read in the Preface of the Benedictine edition of St. Basil, dated Paris, 1721, the following remarks upon the six days' creation: "Among those," say the Benedictines, "who thought that things were created at once, and not by degrees, Philo may be first enumerated. It is not wonderful that Origen, who loved allegories more than all men, should have run into the same opinion. With these may be reckoned that most valiant defender of the Catholic faith, Athanasius. Gregory Nyssen speaks so plainly,

that one cannot doubt that he embraced the same opinion. It" (this opinion) "appeared to Basil more probable than the other; but this most prudent man would not assert anything positively in a doubtful matter." The Fathers, you observe, were divided on the question, Whether the record of the creation in the Book of Genesis was an historical fact or a *myth*.

Again: on the Spirit moving on the waters, I quote from the Benedictine edition of Chrysostom, in c. i. Genesis, Hom. iii. "The Spirit of God," he says, "was borne upon the water. This appears to me to signify that some vital energy was present in the waters, and that the water was not simply standing and unmoved, but moved as having some vital power. For that which is unmoved is altogether useless; but that which is moved is serviceable for many things."

Again:—Genesis vi.: "The sons of God saw the daughters of men." Chrysostom, in his 22nd Homily on Genesis, observes: "Your lore should so apprehend the true meaning of the Scripture as not to lend your ears to those who speak these blasphemies, and dare to say things against their own understanding; for they say that this is not said of men, but of angels; for that God called these 'the sons of God.' Let them shew, first, where angels are called the sons of God." And Augustine, in his Questions on Genesis, concludes; "Whence is it more credible, that just men, who were called either angels or the sons of God, through lust sinned with women, than that angels, who were not flesh, could have descended to this sin?" This opinion, however, which Chrysostom terms "blasphemous," is stated to have been the opinion of "many of the ancients," including Justin, Athenagoras, and Clemens of Alexandria.

In the interpretation of the portion of Scripture

that relates to Rebecca, Jerome writes to Pope Damasus: "Isaac represents God the Father, Rebecca the Holy Spirit, Esau the former people multiplied by the devil, Jacob the Church of Christ. Isaac's growing old signifies the consummation of the world; that he grew blind shows that faith before him perished from the world, and that the light of religion had been neglected." The most fanciful commentator upon Scripture in the present day never approached such an exposition as this in puerility and absurdity.

Turn next to doctrine. Jerome says (Question x. pp. 238— 3), "The vessels of mercy, which He prepared for glory, which He called, that is to say, us who are not from the Jews, but also from the Gentiles, He does not save irrationally, or without a true judgment, but for *preceding causes*, because some have not received the Son of God, and others of their own accord have received Him." So that Jerome was what we should call a very low Arminian. But, says Augustine (Epist. contra Julianum Pelagianum, lib. v.): "Those whom He predestined, them He also called. These are the called according to His purpose. These are therefore elect, and this before the constitution of the world, by Him who calleth those things that be not as though they were, but elect by the election of grace. Whence he says also of Israel, a remnant was made by the election of grace; and lest by chance they should be thought to be elect before the foundation of the world *by reason of their foreknown works*, he proceeded and added, But if by grace, then it is not of works; else grace is no more grace." So that Augustine, in opposition to Jerome, was what we call a Calvinist. Again, on works of supererogation, Chrysostom, on Hebrews x., Homily xix., thus speaks: "And besides, Christ enjoins nothing

which is impossible, since many have *surpassed his commandments.*"

Abraham, according to Chrysostom, actually fixed the knife in his son's throat. He says (Epist. 2 ad Cor., Hom. iii.); "For the hand of the just man fixed it (the sword) in the boy's throat; but the hand of God did not permit it, though fixed in it, to be contaminated by the boy's blood."

Ambrose holds that we must all pass through fire to heaven. In his Exposition of Psalm cxviii. (Benedictine edition, Paris, 1686) he says: "It is necessary that all who desire to return to Paradise should be proved by fire; for it is not written unconcernedly, that Adam and Eve being driven out of the seat of Paradise, God placed a fiery sword which turned every way at their exit from Paradise. It is necessary that all should pass through flames. Whether he be John the Evangelist, whom the Lord so loved that he said of him to Peter, 'If I will that he remain, what is that to thee? do you follow me.' Some have doubted respecting his death; we cannot doubt respecting his passage through the fire, because he is in Paradise, and is not separated from Christ. Or whether it be Peter, who received the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and walked on the sea, it is needful that he should say, 'Thou hast laid affliction upon our loins, thou hast caused men to ride over our heads; we have passed through fire and water, and thou hast brought us into *refrigerium.*'"

Concerning Cain and Abel, Ambrose thus writes (lib. ii. c. 3): "Wherefore we do not unconcernedly wonder in the Gospel that the Lord Jesus sat upon the foal of an ass, because the Gentile people, which according to the Law was accounted unclean, began to be the sacrifice of Christ." And in his book, 'De Elia et Jejunio,' he says of Para-

dise, that "God established the first law about fasting there when he said, 'Ye shall not eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil.'"

In his fifth Homily on Matthew, Chrysostom writes as follows: "They say that John practised such austerity that all his limbs became dead, and from continual prayer and perpetual intercourse with the pavement his forehead was so hard as to be nothing better than the knee of a camel." "That he would grant to me, to be encircled with the body of Paul, to be fastened to his soul, and to see the dust of his body." "To see the dust of those hands by which all were charmed, through the imposition of which the Spirit was supplied." And in the fifty-fourth Homily,—"If we are to be regenerated, the cross is present; if to be nourished with the food, if to be ordained, if to do anything else, that symbol is present. We inscribe it on our houses, walls, windows, forehead."

On the subject of the veneration of relics, Chrysostom, in his Homily "delivered after the relics of the Martyrs, &c.," tom. xii. p. 468, speaks thus: "When the Empress had gone, in the middle of the night, into the great church, and borne thence the relics of the Martyr, and followed them through the middle of the forum, when the church to which the relics belonged was distant nine miles from the city, this sermon was preached in the Martyr's Church, the Empress being present with the magistrates and all the city." "For when the devils see the rays of the sun they suffer nothing; but unable to bear the splendour which proceeds from *these*, being blinded, they fly, and go to a great distance; so great is the power in the ashes of the saints, not only residing in their relics, but proceeding beyond them, and driving away unclean spirits, and sanctifying with much abundance those who approach them in faith."

Wherefore, she (the Empress), loving Christ, followed the relics, continually touching them, and drawing to herself a blessing, and becoming an instructress to all, of this beautiful and spiritual gain, and teaching all to draw from this fountain, which is always drawn from and never emptier; for as the springing streams of the fountains are not contained within their own bosoms, but run over and flow forth, so the grace of the Spirit, which reclines in the bones and dwells in the saint, also goes forth to those who follow it, and runs from the souls to the bodies, and from the bodies to the garments, and from the garments to the sandals, and from the sandals to the shadows. For this reason, not only do the bodies of the holy Apostles work, but also the handkerchiefs and aprons; and not only these, but also the shadow of Peter wrought greater things than the living. Thus it happens also at this day; for whilst the relics were carried, there was the burning of the devils, and howlings and lamentations were raised on every side, the rays issuing forth from the bones, and burning the phalanx of hostile powers." "All will call you blessed, the hostess of the saints, the pattern of Churches, equal in zeal to the Apostles; for though you have had allotted to you a woman's nature, it is permitted to you to rival the acts of the Apostles."

Let us hear Jerome against Vigilantius, who it appears was opposed to the worship of relics. Jerome begins by punning upon his name. "Vigilantius, or rather *Dormitantius*" (the sleepy headed, not the wakeful) "has suddenly arisen, who, with an unclean spirit, fights against Christ, and denies that the sepulchres of the martyrs are to be venerated." "Does the Roman bishop act wrongly, who offers sacrifices to the Lord, over the (according to us) to be venerated bones (but, according to you, the vile

dust) of dead men, Peter and Paul, and regards their graves as altars? And not only does the bishop of one city, but do the bishops of the whole world, err, who, despising the huckster Vigilantius, enter the temple of the dead?" "Tertullian, a most learned man, wrote a celebrated volume against your heresy." "You laugh at the relics of the martyrs, and with Eunonimus, the author of this heresy, calumniate the Church of Christ." "Was the Emperor Constantine sacrilegious, who translated the relics of Andrew, Luke, and Timothy, at which the devils roar, to Constantinople? and those who dwell in Vigilantius confess that they perceive their presence? Is Augustus Arcadius now to be called sacrilegious, who transferred the bones of the blessed Samuel, after a long period, from Judea into Thrace? Are all the bishops to be deemed, not only sacrilegious, but fools, who carried a most vile thing and mouldering ashes in silk and a golden vessel? Are the people of all the Churches foolish, who met the sacred relics, and with such joy received them, as if they beheld the prophet present and living, so that swarms of people were united from Palestine to Chalcedon, and with one voice resounded the praise of Christ?" "They follow the Lamb wherever he goes: if the Lamb is everywhere, these also, who are with the Lamb, are to be believed to be everywhere."

Ambrose has the following passage, on the burying of the bodies of the martyrs, Gervasius and Protasius. I quote from Epistle xxii., chap. i., Benedictine edition, Paris, 1690, p. 875. "The heavens," he says, "declare the glory of God. At his day, by this fortuitous reading, it has been made known what heavens declare the glory of God. Behold at my right hand, behold at my left hand the sacred relics; behold the men of heavenly conversation; behold the trophies of a sublime mind; these are the

'heavens,' which declare 'the glory of God.' And now you hear the devils crying out, confessing to the martyrs that they cannot bear their pains, and saying, 'Why have you come to torment us so grievously?"

Chrysostom (tom. xii. p. 177, in Epist. ad Hebr., c. vii. Hom. xii.): "Wherefore, I said, so that he should not hurt our free-will. It rests with us, therefore, and with him. For it is needful that we should first elect good things; and when we have elected, he also adds what are his. He does not go before our will, lest he should destroy our free-will; but when we have elected, then he brings to us much help."

Let me give an instance or two from Augustine's Retractations, c. xxiii.: "When I was still a priest, it happened that at Carthage, among us who were together, the Apostle's letter to the Romans was read—'I know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal;' which I was not willing to receive of the person of the Apostle, who was already spiritual, but of a man under the law, and not yet under grace, for thus formerly I understood those words, which afterwards, having read some commentators on the Divine Word, whose authority moved me, *I more diligently considered,* and saw that that which he says might even be understood of the Apostle himself, viz., 'We know that the law is spiritual, but I am carnal.' Which I showed, as well as I could, in the books which I lately wrote against the Pelagians." Again, tom i., book 2, c. v.: "Now, there are two books of mine, of which the title is, 'Against the Party of Donatus;' in the first of which books I have said, that it did not please me that schismatics should be violently driven to communion by the force of any secular power; and truly it did not please me, since I had not yet experienced how

much evil their impunity dared, or how much a diligent discipline could confer upon them in changing them for the better." Lib. 2, cxvii.: "When I said in the Fourth Book, that suffering might be substituted for baptism, I adduced the example of that thief, which was not sufficiently apposite, since it is uncertain whether he was not baptized." Chap. lv. p. 117: "Concerning also the thief, to whom it was said, 'To-day thou shalt be with me in Paradise,' I have laid it down as nearly certain, that he was not visibly baptized; whereas it is uncertain, and it is rather to be believed that he was baptized, as I have afterward elsewhere contended."

I proceed next to show how the Fathers themselves condemn one another's errors and absurdities. Chrysostom says: "Who can tolerate Origen, when he says that the souls were angels in heaven, and that after they sinned above, they were cast down into the world, and were confined in these bodies as in graves and sepulchres, in order that they might pay the penalty of their former sins? and that the bodies of believers are not the temples of Christ, but prisons of the condemned?" "I pass over his frivolous exposition of the garment of skins; with what effort and arguments has he striven to make us believe, that the coats of skins were human bodies!" "And who can bear Origen with patience, when he denies, with specious arguments, the resurrection of this flesh, as he most clearly declares in the book of his Explanation of the First Psalm, and in many other places? And who can bear Origen giving to us a paradise in the third heaven, and transferring to heavenly places that paradise which the Scripture describes as belonging to the earth; and so allegorically understanding all the trees, which are described in Genesis, as that all the trees were angelic powers? And who will not instantly cast away and despise

those fallacies, when Origen said of the waters which are above the firmament, that they were not waters but certain forces of heavenly power; and that the waters, again, which are over the earth, that is to say, under the firmament, were contrary powers, that is to say, demons?" "The words of Origen are adverse and hateful, and repugnant to God and His saints; and not those only which I have repeated, but numberless others also." Jerome, also, writing to Pammachius, exclaims: "Depart, O most beloved, from Origen's heresy, and from all other heresies." "Origen teaches that rational creatures gradually descend by Jacob's ladder to the last step, that is to say, to flesh and blood, and that it is impossible that any one should at once be precipitated from the hundredth to the first number, but by single numbers, as by the steps of a ladder, until he reach the last; and that they changed their bodies as often as they changed mansions (in their way) from heaven to earth." And against Vigilantius, letter 79, Jerome says again: "Origen is a heretic; what is that to me, who do not deny that he is a heretic in most things? He erred concerning the resurrection of the body, concerning the state of souls, concerning the repentance of the devil; and what is more, in his Commentaries on Isaiah, he testified that the Son of God, and the Holy Spirit, are seraphim."

Of Tertullian, Jerome writes (to Pammachius and Oceanus): "The blessed Cyprian uses Tertullian as a master, as his writings prove; and although he is delighted with the genius of that erudite and ardent man, he does not, with him, follow Montanus and Maximilla." Of Lactantius and Origen: "Lactantius in his books, and chiefly in his Letters to Demetrius, altogether denies the substance of the Holy Spirit, and with the Jewish error says that he is to be referred either to the Father or the Son, and

that the sanctification of each of these persons is exhibited under his name." And confess also, that Origen errs in some things; acknowledge that he thought wrongly concerning the Son, and worse concerning the Holy Spirit; that he impiously brought forward the (doctrine of the) ruin of the souls from heaven; that he only verbally confesses the resurrection of the flesh, but virtually destroys it: and that he holds, that after many ages and the final restitution of all things, Gabriel would be the same as the devil, Paul as Caiaphas, virgins as harlots." "Others, as well Greeks as Latins, have erred in the faith."

A few extracts from Dupin's 'History of the Fourth and Fifth Centuries' will show the estimate of the Fathers formed by that distinguished and generally impartial Roman Catholic historian. Concerning Eusebius of Cæsarea he says: "He seems to insinuate, in some places, and chiefly book ii. c. 7, that the person of the Son is not equal to the person of the Father, and that the same adoration is not due to Him; and it is not only in these books that he speaks after this manner, for he does the like in all his other writings." Of St. Hilary: "St. Hilary had not very clear notions concerning spiritual beings, for in the Fifth Canon of his Commentary upon St. Matthew, he says that all creatures are corporeal, and that the souls which are in bodies are corporeal substances. He held also an intolerable error concerning the last judgment. I do not insist upon some smaller errors, as when in Canon 31 and 32, on St. Matthew, he excuses the sin of St. Peter; when he says, in Canon 16, that the words of Jesus Christ, 'Get thee behind me, Satan,' were not addressed to this Apostle; upon Psalm cxix., that the Virgin shall be purged by fire at the day of judgment; in Canon 20, that Moses did not die, and that he shall come again at the day

of judgment. Of Gregory Nyssen: "He is always abstruse, either by allegories or abstracted reasonings; he mingles philosophy with divinity, and makes use of the principles of philosophers, both in his explications of mysteries and in his discourses of morality; upon which account his works are more like the treatises of Plato and Aristotle than those of other Christians." "It may be said, also, that St. Gregory Nyssen, having his head full of the books and principles of Origen, could not always be so careful, but some of his errors would slip unawares into his reasonings, though he was not really of his opinion, and he rejected them at other times when he was more attentive." Of Epiphanius, Dupin says: "The style of St. Epiphanius is neither beautiful nor lofty; on the contrary, it is plain, low, and mean. He had much reading and learning, but no faculty of discerning, nor exactness of judgment. He often uses reasons for refuting the heretics which are false. He was very credulous, and not very accurate." And of Jerome: "In St. Jerome's Commentaries, there are also several opinions that savour of Jewish superstitions, or the too great credulity of the first Christians; as when he asserts, in the Commentaries on the Prophets Daniel and Micah, that the world shall last but a thousand years. He sometimes gives allegorical senses to things which are to be understood literally, as when, in the Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, he says that Jacob's wrestling with the angel is not to be understood of a corporeal and visible combat, but mystically of the invisible fight." "When he disputes with Helodius, he commends virginity to that excess, that it was thought he designed to condemn matrimony; and he so exalts the dignity of priests in abating the pride of deacons, that he seems not to think them inferior to bishops."

Let us hear Erasmus also. I quote from Jacobo

Sadoleto, lib. 28. Erasmus says: "Tertullian, whilst he too sharply contends with threats against those who ascribe too much to matrimony, was carried into the other fit, condemning what Christ approved of, and exacting what Christ did not require, but only counselled. Jerome fights with so much ardour against those who exalted matrimony to the injury of virginity, that he could not have defended his cause against an unfavourable judge, if he had been deemed guilty of having treated marriage, and second marriage, with too little respect. Augustine, fighting with all his energy against Pelagius, sometimes attributes less to free will than the theologians who now reign in the schools think right." "If these things are to be wrested against him who sometimes errs, what shall we do to the same Hilary (besides so many other distinguished doctors of the Church), who, in so many places, seems to feel that Christ had a body which was not susceptible of pain, and that hunger, thirst, weariness, and other affections of this kind, were not natural in Him, but pretended? For this he plainly wrote in expounding the sixty-eighth Psalm." Again: Erasmus writes (26th book of Letters): "Jerome differed from Ambrose and Cyprian; there was not a slight skirmishing between him and Augustine; and who is there of the ancients from whom the more recent theologians do not differ in many places?"

The *corruptions* of the writings of the Fathers is a topic I must not pass over. Erasmus writes, in his Epistles (In Sanct. Basilii librum de Spiritu Sancto), "I appeared to myself to have detected, in this work, what we behold with indignation to have been done in certain of the most celebrated and extolled writers, as in Athanasius, Chrysostom, and Jerome. You ask, What is this? After I had gone through half of the work without weariness, the phraseology

appeared to me to belong to another parent, and to breathe a different genius; sometimes the diction swelled out to the tragic style, and it subsided again into common discourse; sometimes it appeared to me to have something flowing softly. . . . From these circumstances a suspicion entered my mind, that some student, in order to render the volume more copious, had interwoven some things, either grafts culled from other authors (for this subject has been accurately handled by many of the Greeks), or devised by himself; for some of these are erudite, but differing from Basil's style! . . Moreover, it is a most wicked species of contamination to intervene one's own cloth with most distinguished purple of celebrated men; or, to express myself more correctly, to corrupt their generous wine with one's own dead stuff; which has been done, with intolerable sacrilege, in the divine Jerome's Commentaries on the Psalms, so evidently that it cannot be denied." And again, quoting still from Erasmus (In Hilarium Epist. lib. 28): "What is this temerity with other people's books, especially those of the ancients, whose memory is, or ought to be, sacred to us . . . that every one, according to his fancy, should shave, expunge, add, take away, change, substitute?" And once more (In Athan. Epist. ad Serapionem de Spiritu Sancto): "We have given some fragments of this sort. For what purpose? you will say. That it may hence appear with what impiety the Greek scribes have raged against the monuments of such men, in which even to change a syllable is sacrilege. And what has not the same temerity dared to do among the Latins, in substituting, mutilating, increasing, and contaminating the commentaries of the orthodox."

A multitude of works, it seems, have been falsely ascribed to Chrysostom. In the Benedictine Edition of that Father, tom. v. p. 672 (Paris, 1836) in the

admonition to the Homily on the fifteenth Psalm, we read: "John Chrysostom was so highly esteemed by the Greeks, that his works and small treatises were sought with the greatest eagerness; and whatever bore the name of Chrysostom was held as genuine by men not endowed with critical knowledge, such as were almost all those of the later ages. There were persons who rashly embellished with the name of Chrysostom sermons and homilies written by themselves. Transcribers of books also, for the sake of gain, sold homilies patched together by themselves or others, with the name of Chrysostom in the title-page. Hence proceeded innumerable spurious works; of which some immediately supply the evidence of spuriousness, others require a fuller investigation." Doubts, also, are felt about Basil's works, as may be seen by the Benedictine Preface (Paris, 1721). "It remained that I should separate the true works of Basil from the false ones, which separation revealed a labour of the most extensive kind, since there are not a few of his writings that are called in question, but all of them. The learned, indeed, differ among themselves respecting the number of the homilies on the six days' work, and the Psalms. These one-and-thirty Orations are not all ascribed to one and the same writer. The two books which we have on baptism are held to be doubtful by some persons. The book on true virginity is controverted. That most ample book on the first sixteen chapters of Isaiah is not exempt from all suspicion. The opinion of all persons is not one respecting the five books against Eunomius. There are those who have not been ashamed to place among the false and supposititious the last fifteen chapters, and those the principal chapters, of the book on the Holy Spirit. The opinions of the ancients and more modern concerning his ascetic writings do

not agree. Hardly anything certain can be defined respecting the liturgy. His epistles contain, as it were, a sort of seminary of quarrels and discords. For in what year, in what month, from whom to whom, respecting what subject, they were written, is daily, vehemently, and sharply disputed. All must perceive, I think, how easy it is to err in this so great variety of things and opinions as in a moonless night." Again, p. 48: "I have in a certain place admonished you, that that commentary on the first sixteen chapters of Isaiah, although it is held by almost all to be the genuine offspring of Basil, is not exempt from all suspicion; you will find, indeed, very few who deny it, if you compare them with those who affirm the commentary to be truly Basil's. For, among the latter, you may reckon Maximus the Confessor, John of Damascus, Marasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, &c. Nor is it wonderful if the more modern, after the example of the ancients, have embraced the same opinion. The most celebrated of them, Taliman, Ducas, Cambeficius, Natalis Alexander, Dupin, Tillemont, and Lequier, to whose opinion, unless most serious reasons hindered me, I should always be proud to accede. It is more easy to enumerate the patrons of the other opinion, since we find only three or four; John Drungar, Erasmus, Rivetus, Petavius. But I am so far, therefore, from ascribing that imperfect commentary to St. Basil, that I deem it to be most unworthy of him. I have perused and reperused the work, nor have I ever found anything Basilian. Everything has a foreign odour; whatever all the most erudite admire in the writings of Basil—perspicuity of speech, eloquence, a certain wonderful facility in interpreting Scripture, the selection of the best words, weighty opinions — of these not even a vestige exists in these commentaries."

Of the falsifications of the works of the Fathers generally, we read in the same preface: "It is difficult to say how great diligence must be applied by him who wishes certainly and safely to decide respecting the spuriousness or genuineness of any work; for it is wonderful, since truth and falsehood so greatly differ, yet one very frequently so much resembles the other, that in distinguishing between them we can scarcely avoid error, unless we take great care." And again: "Perhaps there is no class of men who have more injured good study than those who have mixed up the true writings of the Fathers with false ones; for how many evils have, both formerly and in the present day, sprung up from hence, nobody who is not altogether inexperienced in ecclesiastical matters is ignorant, doctrines are obscured, morals are polluted, history falters, tradition is disturbed; and to express my meaning in a word, if once the genuine writings of the holy Fathers are confounded with the adulterous ones, all things must necessarily be confounded together. The examples of what I have stated are too frequent for it to be necessary for me to mention any of them. I will only call to mind the imprudence of the Apollinarists and the Eutychians, who, when they had promulgated their own for the sincere and true writings of the holy Fathers, so infested the whole Church, that even until this present day it has been impossible to close and cure this kind of wound. For at the present day, *so great is the disagreement* among the erudite respecting the authorship of certain writers, that if any one adduces any evidence, either of that great Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, or of Julius, the high Pontiff, or of Gregory, the wonder-worker, immediately you will hear some say that Athanasius, Julius, Gregory, did not say these things, but Apollinarius, some of whose

works were formerly deceitfully attributed to these great men, in order that the more simple might be led astray. But, to be now silent respecting the Apollinarists and Eutychians, I will generally observe, that innumerable inconveniences flowed from the same fountain."

So difficult, or rather impossible, is it to ascertain the true works of the Fathers. When we *do* reach them, then, from the specimens and examples I have adduced, I venture to assert that every dispassionate judge must come to the conclusion that they are not competent expounders of Holy Writ, that they contradict one another, and propose comments so superstitious and fanatical, that in some instances we might as well go to Johanna Southcote, or the wildest interpreters of the present age.

I do not mean to deny that there are some beautiful, and Scriptural, and truly Protestant statements to be found in the Fathers, or the good cannot be separated from the bad. It is but fair that I should present some evidence of this. Three or four extracts will illustrate my meaning; and with them I will conclude this part of the subject.

Gregory Nazianzen, Oratio 42, vii.: "But you contained walls, and tablets, and elegantly cut stones, and long circuitous passages; and you were resplendent on every side with gold, and you scattered it as water, and treasured it up as the sand; being ignorant that faith in the open air is better than sumptuous impiety; and that a few gathered together in the name of the Lord are more in the estimation of God than many thousands who deny the Godhead. Whether truly will you prefer all the Canaanites to one Abraham; or the inhabitants of Sodom to one Lot; or the Midianites to Moses—to those who were sojourners and foreigners? Will you prefer to the three hundred who nobly drank with Gideon, the

thousands who turned away; or to those born in the house of Abraham, who were scarcely more in number than these, many kings, and the ten thousands of the army, whom, though they were few, they pursued and put to flight? But how do you understand this passage—'Although the number of the children of Israel were as the sand of the sea, a remnant should be saved'? And how the following, 'I have left to myself seven thousand men who have not bowed the knee to Baal'? Is it not, God is not well pleased with the many? You reckon up the tens of thousands, but God reckons the saved; you indeed (reckon) the innumerable dust, but I (reckon) the vessels of election. For nothing is so magnificent to God as pure language and a soul perfect in the doctrines of truth."

Basil: "But whether the bishops are ejected from their churches, let not this at all move you; or whether any betrayers have proceeded from the clergy themselves, let not this weaken your faith in God. For they are not names which save us, but our purpose, and a true love towards Him who created us. Consider that in the conspiracy against our Lord the chief priests and scribes and elders prepared the deceit, but there were found a few among the people who truly received the word: and that it is not the multitude which is saved, but the elect of God. Let not, therefore, the multitude of the people terrify you, who are carried about like the water of the sea by the winds: for if ever one be saved, like Lot in Sodom, he ought to remain in a right judgment, having an immovable hope in Christ, because the Lord will not desert His saints."

Augustine to Jerome, tom. ii., p. 551: "For I confess to your charity, that I have learned to ascribe only to the books of the Scriptures which are now called canonical, such fear and honour as to believe

that not one of their authors erred in anything; and if I should stumble at anything in them which appears to be opposed to truth, I should not doubt, either that the manuscript was fallacious, or that the interpreter had not followed what was said, or that I had not all understood it. But I read the others in such wise, that however they may excel in sanctity and doctrine, I do not think a thing true because they have been of that opinion, but because they have been able to persuade me, either by those canonical authors, or by a probable reason which is not abhorrent from the truth. Nor do I think that you, O my brother, think at all otherwise; I do not believe that you desire at all that your books should be read like those of the Prophets and Apostles, concerning whose writings it is wicked to doubt that they are exempt from error. Far be this from your pious humility, and your correct thoughts of yourself."

Jerome (Letter to Pammachius and Oceanus on Origen's errors): "For what folly it is, so to praise any one's doctrine as to follow his blasphemy! Even the blessed Cyprian uses Tertullian as his master, as his writings prove; and although he is well pleased with the understanding of that erudite and ardent man, he does not follow with him Montanus and Maximilla. Apollinarius wrote very strong books against Porphyry; Eusebius ably composed an ecclesiastical history; one of them introduced a divided Christian system, the other was a most open defender of the impiety of Arius."

Jerome on Lactantius' heresy: "An apostle teaches, 'Reading all things, holding fast those things which are good.' Lactantius in his books, and especially in his Epistles to Demetrian, altogether denies the substance of the Holy Spirit, and with the Jewish error says, that he is to be referred either to the Father or to the Son, and that the sanctification of

each person is shown under his name. Who can forbid me to read his books of Institutions, in which he wrote most forcibly against the Gentiles, because his former opinion is worthy of detestation?"

Jerome (Apology against Ruffinus): "Forasmuch as you are fickle, you have argued with wonderful acuteness in my praise and dispraise; and (you hold) that you have as much right to speak favourably or unfavourably of me as I had to censure Origen and Didymus, whom I formerly had praised. Learn, therefore, O most learned man, and the head of the Roman art of logic, that it is no fault to praise the same man in some things and to accuse him in others, but to praise and condemn the same thing. In Tertullian, we praise his genius, but we condemn his heresy; in Origen, we admire his knowledge of the Scriptures, and yet we do not receive the fallacy of his doctrines; in Didymus, we acknowledge both his memory and his purity on the faith of the Trinity, but in other things, in which he wrongly trusted to Origen, we withdraw from him. For not *the vices*, but *the virtues* of masters are to be imitated."

The Fathers not only contradict each other on the most important texts, but are not reliable as interpreters. Their criticism is often fanciful. Their unanimity is the sand, not the rock. The superstructure must sooner or later crumble and fall.

XII.

CANONICAL CURSES.

A FOUNTAIN does not send forth sweet water and bitter. "Bless, and curse not," is the Divine command. The Church of Rome has not regarded the fact in nature or the prescription of revelation. Her curses are as numerous as her benedictions. Her power to put heretics to death is broken; her power of cursing them is as great and terrible as ever. The following is an authentic specimen—

"By the authority of God Almighty, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and the undefiled Virgin Mary, mother and patroness of our Saviour, and of all celestial virtues, Angels, Archangels, Thrones, Dominions, Powers, Cherubims, and Seraphims, and of all the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, and of all the Apostles and Evangelists of the Holy Innocents, who in the sight of the Holy Lamb are found worthy to sing the new song of the Holy Martyrs and Holy Confessors; and of all the Holy Virgins and of all saints, together with the elect of God—may he, William Hogan, be damned. We excommunicate and anathematize him from the threshold of the Holy Church of God Almighty, we sequester him that he may be tormented, disposed, and be delivered over with Dathan and Abiram, and with those who say unto the Lord, 'Depart from us, we desire none

of thy ways;' as a fire is quenched by water, so let the light of him be put out for evermore, unless it shall repent him, and make satisfaction. Amen.

"May the Father, who creates man, curse him! may the Son, who suffered for us, curse him! may the Holy Ghost, who suffered for us in baptism, curse him! may the holy cross which Christ for our salvation, triumphing over his enemies, ascended, curse him!

"May the holy and eternal Virgin Mary, mother of God, curse him! may St. Michael, the advocate of the holy souls, curse him! may all the angels, principalities, and powers, and all heavenly armies, curse him!

"May the praiseworthy multitude of patriarchs and prophets curse him!

"May St. John the precursor, and St. John the Baptist, and St. Peter, and St. Paul, and St. Andrew, and other of Christ's Apostles, together, curse him! and may the rest of our disciples and evangelists, who by their preaching converted the universe, and the holy and wonderful company of martyrs and confessors, who by their works are found pleasing to God Almighty—may the holy choir of the holy virgins, who for the honour of Christ have despised the things of the world, damn him! may all the saints from the beginning of the world to everlasting ages, who are found to be beloved by God, damn him!

"May he be damned, wherever he be, whether in the house or in the stable, the garden or the field, or in the highways or in the woods, or in the church; may he be cursed in living and dying.

"May he be cursed in eating and drinking, in being hungry, in being thirsty, in fasting, and sleeping, in slumbering, and in sitting, in living, in working, in resting, and blood letting!

"May he be cursed in all the faculties of his body!

"May he be cursed inwardly and outwardly; may he be cursed in his brain and his vertex, in his temples, in his eyebrows, in his cheeks, in his jawbones, in his nostrils, in his teeth and grinders, in his lips, in his shoulders, in his arms, in his fingers!

"May he be damned in his mouth, in his breast, in his heart, and purtenance, down to the very stomach!

"May he be cursed in his reins, ... and his knees, his legs, and feet, and toenails!

"May he be cursed in all his joints, and articulation of the members; from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet, may there be no soundness!

"May the Son of the living God, with all the glory of His majesty, curse him! and may heaven with all the powers that move therein, rise up against him and curse and damn him; unless he repent and make satisfaction! Amen. So be it. Be it so. Amen."

See 'A Debate on the Roman Catholic Religion, held in the Sycamore Street Meeting House, Cincinnati, from the 13th to the 21st of January; between Alexander Campbell, of Bethany, Virginia, and the Right Rev. John Purcell, Bishop of Cincinnati.' Pages 330, 331.

Bishop Wilson, of Nottingham, heard this curse read at a public meeting, and, afraid of its effect, with characteristic tact he stated that Dr. Breckenridge and Mr. Campbell copied the curse from 'Tristram Shandy,' the work of Sterne, and tried wickedly and dishonestly to fasten the fanciful conceit on the Church of Rome. Bishop Wilson wrote out this charge and sent it to the newspapers. On referring to Campbell and Purcell's debate on the Roman Catholic question, from which the curse is taken, we find that Campbell states *a fact*, viz., that the curse

above printed, and given *verbatim* by Mr. Campbell, was read and levelled against a certain Priest by his Bishop, on a certain day, and in a certain church, in a certain diocese of the United States.

Bishop Purcell rises and makes his speech in reply to this allegation. If the very form of the curse was either unknown, or absurd, or unauthorised, we should expect that the Bishop would have taken the very first opportunity that occurred to denounce it; and knowing, as he did, all the circumstances of the case, by his own admission, we should also expect that he would have further declared it a fabrication and an untruth. But the Bishop does neither; he is silent on this part of the charge altogether.

Mr. Campbell, the Protestant advocate, rises again, confirms his statements by additional facts, and closes.

The Bishop then makes his next speech. Does he now deny the fact alleged, viz., that this curse was read, as declared by Mr. Campbell, in the presence of Protestants and Romanists? No! This he did not, and dare not. What, then, does the Bishop do? He asserts, in reply to a charge of a *matter of fact*, that he must spoil their fun—that the curse is neither Protestant nor Papal, but a *jeu d'esprit* of Sterne in 'Tristram Shandy.'

Mr. Campbell says the curse was verbatim denounced by a Romish Bishop on Hogan. Bishop Purcell replies, "*The curse is in 'Tristram Shandy.'*"

Bishop Purcell shows by the sentence that follows, that his sole object was to raise a little merriment at Mr. Campbell's expense, thereby to divert the audience from the notorious fact, and that he did not mean seriously to say that Mr. Campbell copied it from 'Tristram Shandy;' *for the Bishop instantly begins to defend the curse*, by comparing it with Scripture.

It is naturally asked—How do you explain its ex-

istence in 'Tristram Shandy?' I reply,—Sterne, whose effort it was in writing that work to show his learning, which was vast and varied, *copied the curse*, as he actually *admits* in a foot-note, from the Leger of Rochester Cathedral in the charge of the Dean and Chapter; and the only alteration made by Sterne was the substitution of an imaginary name (Obadiah), and an imaginary offence (tying the knot).

I have copied the Curse verbatim, leaving out two or three indelicate parts, *from a work in the British Museum, bearing date* 1681, extracted and published verbatim from the Leger Book of Rochester Church, about *seventy* years before 'Tristram Shandy' was written, and some *thirty* years before Sterne was born, and, as testified by the Librarian, bound up at least one hundred years ago. I give the title, and also the *press-mark*. It is as follows: "The Pope's Dreadful Curse, being a form of Excommunication of the Church of Rome, taken out of the Leger Book of the Church of Rochester, now in the custody of the Dean and Chapter, there writ by Ernulphus, Bishop. London: printed and sold by L. C., on Ludgate Hill, 1681. 13 L. L., C 1."

How a book printed in 1681 was copied from a book written seventy years afterwards, and how the Leger Book of Rochester was copied from 'Tristram Shandy' by Ernulphus the Bishop, who lived six centuries before Sterne was born, are weighty and most conclusive questions.

It was a regular formula of cursing in the Romish days of Rochester Cathedral. The work I copy from is entitled, '*Textus Roffensis e codicibus MSS. descripsit ediditque Thos. Hearne, Oxonii e Theatro Sheldeniano*, 1720,' chap. 35 p. 55. The original is in Rochester Cathedral, written by Ernulphus the Bishop, of whom I quote the following sentence out of Bishop Nicolson's 'Historical Library,' 2nd edit.,

p. 134; London, 1714: "The most venerable monument of antiquity that belongs to the church of Rochester is the 'Textus Ruffensis,' which may justly challenge a respect more than ordinary. It was written by Bishop Ernulph, and has in it the form of cursing by Bell, Book, and Candle." Ernulph was consecrated Bishop of Rochester, December 26th, 1115, and died March, 1124. The original is as follows:—

"Ex auctoritate Dei Omnipotentis, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, et sanctorum canonum, sanctæque et intemeratæ Virginis Dei genetricis Mariæ, atque omnium cœlestium virtutum, angelorum, archangelorum, thronorum, dominationum, potestatuum, cherubin ac seraphin, et sanctorum patriarcharum, prophetarum, et omnium apostolorum et evangelistarum, et sanctorum innocentum, qui in conspectu Agni Sancti digni inventi sunt canticum cantare novum, et sanctorum martyrum et sanctorum confessorum, et sanctarum virginum, atque omnium simul sanctorum et electarum Dei,—Excommunicamus, et anathematizamus (vel) hunc (os) furem (s), vel hunc (vel) (os) malefactorum (s), N.N. et à liminibus sanctæ Dei ecclesiæ sequestramus, et æternis supplicitis excruciandus (vel i.), mancipetur (n), cum Dathan et Abiram, et cum his qui dixerunt Domino Deo, Recede à nobis, scientiam viarum tuarum nolumus: et sicut aquà ignis extinguitur, sic extinguatur lucerna (vel) ejus (eorum) in secula seculorum nisi respuerit (n), et ad satisfactionem venerit (n). Amen. Maledicat illum (os) Deus Pater qui hominem creavit. Maledicat illum (os) Dei Filius qui pro homine passus est. Maledicat illum (os) Spiritus Sanctus qui in baptismo effusus est. Maledicat illum (os) sancta crux, quam Christus pro nostrâ salute hostem triumphans ascendit. Maledicat illum (os) sancta Dei genetrix et perpetua Virgo Maria. Maledicat illum

(os) sanctus Michael ani marum susceptor sacrarum. Maledicat illum (os) omnes angeli et archangeli, principatus et potestates, omnesque militia cœ. lestes. Maledicat illum (os) patriarcharum et prophetarum laudabilis numerus. Maledicant illum (os) sanctus Johannes Præcurso et Baptista Christi, et sanctus Petrus, et sanctus Paulus, atque sanctus Andreas, omnesque Christi apostoli, simul et cæteri discipuli, quatuor quoque evangelistæ, qui sua prædicatione mundum universum converterunt. Maledicat illum (os) cuneus martyrum et confessorum mirificus, qui Deo bonis operibus placitus inventus est. Maledicant illum (os) sacrarum virginum chori, quæ mundi vana causa honoris Christi respuenda contempserunt. Maledicant illum (os) omnes sancti qui ab initio mundi usque in finem seculi Deo dilecti inveniuntur. Maledicant illum (os) cœli et terra, et omnia sancta in eis manentia. Male. dictus (i) sit (n) ubicunque, fuerit (n), sive in domo, sive in viâ, sive in semitâ, sive in silvâ, sive in aquâ, sive in ecclesia. Maledictus (i) sit (n) vivendo, moriendo, manducando, bibendo, esuriendo, sitiendo, jejunando, dormitando, dormiendo, vigilando, ambulando, stando, sedendo, jacendo, operando, quiescendo, mingendo, cacando, flebotomando. Maledictus (i) sit (n) in totis viribus corporis. Maledictus (i) sit (n) intus et exterius. Maledictus (i) sit (n) in capillis; maledictus (i) sit (n) in cerebro. Maledictus (i) sit (n) in vertice, in temporibus, in fronte, in auriculis, in superciliis, in oculis, in genis, in maxillis, in naribus, in dentibus, mordacibus, in labris sive molibus, in labiis, in guttere, in humeris, in carpis, in brachiis, in manubus, in digitis, in peetore, in corde, et in omnibus interioribus stomacho tenus, in renibus, in inguine, in femore, in genitalibus, incoxis, in genubus, in cruribus, in pedibus, et in unguibus. Maledictus (i) sit (n) in totis compagibus membrorum, â vertice capitis, usque ad plantam pedis.

—Non sit in eo sanitas. Maledicat illum (os) Christus Filius Dei vivi toto suæ majestatis imperio, et insurgat adversus illum cœlum cum omnibus virtutibus quæ in co moventur ad *damnandum* eum, nisi pœnituerit et ad satisfactionem venerit. Amen. Fiat, fiat. Amen."

The above is the transcript of the form of cursing regularly written out and duly practised as occasion required by Ernulphus, the Bishop of Rochester, in the twelfth century. Sterne copied the original and genuine document.

It is thus shown that Bishop Purcell did not deny or meet the *matter of fact* charge of Mr. Campbell, thereby admitting it to be true; but that, on the contrary, he tried to defend the Curse, by comparing it with Sacred Writ; and it is clearly shown, in the next place, that the Curse is a *bonâ fide* document, *capable* of legal proof, and *incapable, ipso facto,* of being copied from 'Tristram Shandy.' Bishop Purcell and Bishop Wilson have both, author and imitator, tried to escape the odium fastened on their Church by a transparent *ruse de guerre.*

I refer next to an excommunication denounced by Cardinal Peter Pazmann, Archbishop of Strigonium, and Primate of Hungary, against twenty-four Protestant Ministers, A.D. 1632. It was read publicly in the cathedral the 19th, 22nd, and 27th days of December, 1632, and it was only by the interposition of Prince Stanislaus, and the still more powerful interposition of the payment of 130 aurei, or crowns, on March 22nd, 1633, and by humiliating submissions, that it was withdrawn. I give Latin and English. It is found in 'Historia Ecclesiæ Evangelicæ in Hungaria,' pp. 302—304. Halberstadt, 1830;—

"Formula Excommunicationis Pastorum viginti quatuor Regalium in Scepusio, auctoritate

"The Form of Excommunication of twenty-four royal pastors in Czepuss, drawn up in

Petri Pazmanni, Archiepiscopi Strigoniensis, anno 1632 confectæ.

"Ex auctoritate Dei Omnipotentis, Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, et Sanctæ Mariæ Virginus matris Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et sanctorum angelorum et Archangelorum et St. Michaelis et St. Baptistæ, et ex vice B. Petri Apostoli et aliorum apostolorum, et St. Stephani et omnium martyrum, Sylvestri et D. Adalberti et omnium confessorum, et S. Adelgundis et S. Virginum et omnium Sanctorum, qui sunt in cœlo et in terra, quibus data est potestas ligandi et solvendi: Excommunicamus, damnamus, maledicimus, vinculo anathematis, et a liminibus sanctæ matris Ecclesiæ segregamus illos fures, sacrilegas, raptores, consiliarios, adjutores, adjutrices, qui hoc furtum sive hoc malum perpetrarunt, sive sibi aliquid usurpaverunt. Sit pars eorum cum Core, Datan, et Abiram, quos terra propter eorum peccata deglutivit; sit etiam pars illorum cum Juda traditore, qui Dominum pretio vendidit. Amen. Et cum Pontio Pilato et cum iis qui Domino dixerunt, 'Recede a nobis, scientiam nolumus tuam.' Fiant filii eorum orphani: sint maledicti in civitate, maledicti in agro, in campo. in sylva, in domibus; maledicti in horreis, in lectulis, in cubiculis; maledicti in curia, in via, in villa; maledicti in castro, in flumine; maledicti in Ecclesia, in cœmeterio, in tribunalibus judicii; maledicti in foro, in bello; maledicti in orando, loquendo, tacendo, manducando, vigilando, dormiendo, bibendo, palpando, sedendo, jacendo, stando; male-

1632, by the authority of Peter Pazmann, Archbishop of Strigonium.

"By the authority of God Almighty, the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, and of the Holy Virgin Mary, the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Angels and Archangels, and of St. Michael, and of St. [John the] Baptist, and in the place of St. Peter and the other Apostles, and of St. Stephen and all the martyrs, of Sylvester and St. Adalbert and all the confessors, and of St. Adelgunde and of all the holy virgins and saints, who are in heaven and on earth, to whom is given the power of binding and loosing: We excommunicate, damn, anathematise, and separate from the threshold of the church those thieves and sacrilegious persons, robbers, counsellors, helpers, whether male or female, who have committed this theft or evil, or have hence usurped anything to themselves. Let their portion be with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, whom the earth swallowed up on account of their sins, let their portion be with Judas the traitor, who sold the Lord for a price. Amen. And with Pontius Pilate, and with those who said unto the Lord, 'Depart from us for we desire not the knowledge of thee.' Let their children be orphan; let them be cursed in the city, cursed in the field, in the open field, in the wood, at home; cursed in their barns, on their couches, in their bedchambers; cursed in the court, on the road, in the city; cursed in the camp, on the river; cursed in the church, in the burial ground, in the Courts

dicti in otio; maledicti in otio; maledicti omni tempore. Maledicti in toto corpore, in tota anima, et in quinque sensibus corporis; maledictus fructus ventris eorum; maledictus fructus terræ eorum; maledicta sint omnia eorum; maledictum caput eorum, ora, nares, nasus, labia, fauces, dentes, oculi, pupillæ, cerebrum, palatum, linguæ, guttara, pectus, corda, venter, jecur, viscera omnia; maledictus stomachus, splen, umbilicus, vesica; maledicta sint crura, tibiæ, pedes, et pollices eorum; maledicta colla, scapulæ, dorsum, brachia, cubitus; maledicta manus, et digitus; maledicti ungues in manibus et in pedibus; maledicta costa, genitura, genua, caro, ossa; maledictus sanguis eorum; maledicta pellis; maledicta sit medulla in ossibus eorum; quicquid interest eorum, maledicantur in Christi passione et cum quinque vulneribus Christi, et cum effusione sanguinis Christi, et cum lacte Virginis Mariæ.

"Adjuro te, Lucifer! cum omnibus satellitibus tuis, item cum Patre et Filio, et cum Spiritu Sancto, et cum humanitate et nativitate Domini, et cum virtute omnium Sanctorum, ut nullam habeas quietem diebus ac noctibus, donec perdusceris eos ad interitum; sive in fluminibus mergantur, sive suspendantur, vel devorentura bestiis, sive comburantur, sive interficiantur ab inimicis, odeo habeantur ab omnibus viventibus, vel olum manes eorum. Et sicut Dominus Petro of Justice; cursed in the marketplace, in war; cursed in praying, in speaking, in holding their tongues, in eating, awake, in sleeping, drinking, touching, sitting, lying down, standing, cursed when at leisure; cursed always. Cursed in the whole of their body and soul, and in the five senses of their body; cursed be the fruit of their womb; the fruit of their land; cursed be all their goods; cursed their head, mouths, nostrils, nose, lips, jaws, teeth, eyes, pupils of the eye, brain, palate, tongue, throats, breasts, hearts, belly, liver, all [their] entrails; cursed the stomach, spleen, navel, bladder; cursed be their legs, thighs, feet, and toes; cursed [their] necks, shoulders, back, arms, elbows; cursed the hands and finger[s]; cursed [their] finger and toe nails; cursed their ribs, conception, knees, flesh, bones; cursed [be] their blood; cursed [their] skin; cursed be the marrow of their bones; and whatever concerns them; cursed be they in the possession of Christ, and with the shedding of Christ's blood, and with the milk of the Virgin Mary.

"I abjure thee, O Lucifer! with all thy imps, also with the Father and the Son, and with the Holy Spirit, and with the human nature and nativity of the Lord, and with the virtue of all the saints, that thou rest not night and day, until thou hast brought them to destruction; whether they be drowned in rivers, or be hung, or be devoured by beasts, or be burnt, or be slain by enemies, let them be hated by every person living or even their ghosts. And as the Lord conferred on

et ejus successoribus, quorum vices tenemus, et nobis, quamvis indignis, potestatem contulit ut, quodcunque ligaverimus in terris, ligetur etiam in cœlis, et quodcunque solverimus in terris, solveretur et in cœlo, sic illis cœlum claudimus, et terram ad sepulturam negamus, sed sepeliantur in pascuis asinorum. Insuper sit terra maledicta, inqua fit sepultura eorum; pereant in futuro judicio; conversationem cum christianis non habeant, neque corpus Domini, cum in mortis articulo sun suscipiant: fiant tanquam pulvis ante faciem venti; et sicuti Lucifer dejectus est de cœlo, it sicuti, Adam et Eva e Paradiso ejecti sunt, sic expellantur de quotidiana luce. Item consociati sint cum illis quibus Dominus dicet in die judicii—'Ite, maledicti, in ignem æternum, qui paratus est Diabolo et Angelis ejus, ubi vermis eorum non morietur, nec ignis extinguetur.' Et sicut candela hæc de manibus meis ejecta extinguitur, sic corpora eorum et animæ eorum in fœtore baratri extinguantur, nisi reddant, quod furati sunt, intra certum terminum. Dicunt omnes, Amen." (Historia Ecclesiæ Evangelicæ in Hungaria, pp. 302—304, Halberstadt, 1830.)

Peter and his successors, whose places we hold, and on ourselves, although unworthy, the power, that whatsoever we shall bind on earth be also bound in heaven, and whatsoever we shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven, so we shut heaven against them, and deny them earth for burial, but let them be buried in the feeding grounds of asses. Moreover, let the earth be cursed in which they are buried; let them perish in the future judgment; let them not have any conversation with Christians, nor, when they are in the article of death, let them receive the Lord's body: let them be as the dust before the wind; and as Lucifer was cast down from heaven, and as Adam and Eve were cast out of Paradise, so let them be expelled from the light of every day. Let them also be associated with those to whom the Lord will say at the day of judgment,—'Depart, ye cursed, into the everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, where their worm shall not die nor their fire be extinguished.' And as this candle, being thrown out of my hands, is extinguished, so let their bodies and souls be extinguished in the stink of hell, unless they restore what they have stolen within a certain limit. Let every one say, Amen."

Anything more shocking to every feeling of love or humanity in the Christian heart it is difficult to imagine. We have here the concentrated venom of evil—the worst wishes of a wicked heart embodied—and irrefragable proof that a religion that authenticates and uses such imprecations cannot be of God.

In the 'Edinburgh Encyclopedia' are other forms of cursing, under the head "Excommunications."

I will quote from the 'Pontificale Romanum' *(p. 466; Antwerp, 1627)*, the greatest authority in the Papacy:—

"*Idcirco eum cum universis complicibus fautoribusque suis judicio Dei omnipotentis. Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti et beati, Petri principus Apostolorum et omnium sanctorum et mediœritatis, nostra auctoritate et potestate ligandi et solvendi in cœlo et terra, nobis divinitus collata a pretiosi corporio et sanguinus Divini, perceptione et a societate omnium Christianorum, seperamus et liminibus sanctæ matris ecclesiæ in cœlo et in terra, excludimus et excommunicatum et unathematizatum, esse decernimus et damnatum cum diabolo et angelis, ejus et omnibus reprobis inignem eturnum judicamus.*"

"Wherefore by the judgment of the omnipotent God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, and of St. Peter the prince of the Apostles, and of all the Saints, and by our own authority, and in virtue of our power of binding and loosing in heaven and earth, we separate him, with all his accomplices and supporters, from participation of the precious body and blood of God, and from the society of Christians, and we exclude him from the gates of holy Mother Church in heaven and earth, and we sentence him to be excommunicated and anathematised, and to be damned with the devil and his angels, and with all reprobates to eternal fire."

In the 'Pontificale Romanum' is found the following Curse, which the officiating Bishop pronounces on receiving an inmate to a convent:—

"Auctoritate omnipotentis Dei et beatorum Petri Pauli apostolorum ejus, firmiter et sub interminatione anathematis inhibemus, ne quis præsentes virgines seu sanctimoniales a divino servitio, cui sub vexillo castitatis subiectæ sunt, abducat, nullus earum bona surripiat, sed ea cum quiete possideant si quis autem hoc attentare præsumpserit, maledictus sit in domo et extra domum; maledictus incinitate, et in agro; maledictus vigilando et dormiendo; maledictus manducando

"By the authority of the Omnipotent God, and of St. Peter and St. Paul, His apostles, we firmly, and under the threat of anathema, enjoin that no one carry off these virgins or religious persons here present from Divine service, to which, under the standard of chastity they have been dedicated, that no one plunder their property, but that they enjoy it in quiet. If any one shall have presumed to attempt this, may he be cursed in his home and out of his home, may he be cursed in the state

et bibendo: maledictus ambulando, et sedendo: maledicta sint cara ejus et ossa, et a planta pedis usque ad verticem non habeat sanitatem. Veniat super illum maledictio hominis quam per moysen in lege filiis iniquitatis dominus permisit. Deleatur nomen eius de libro viventium, et cum justis non scribatur. Fiat pars et hereditas ejus cum Cain fratricida cum Dathan et Abiron cum Anania et Saphira cum Simone Mago et Juda proditore et cum eis, qui dixerunt Deo, Recede a nobis, semitum viarum tuarum nolumus. Pereat in die judicie, devoret eum ignis perpetuus cum diabolo, et angelis ejus, nisi restituerit et ad emendationem venerit. Fiat, Fiat."

(or city), and in the field, cursed in watching, and cursed in sleeping, cursed in eating and drinking, cursed in walking and sitting, MAY HIS FLESH AND HIS BONES BE CURSED, AND FROM THE SOLE OF HIS FOOT TO THE CROWN OF HIS HEAD MAY HE ENJOY NO HEALTH. May there light upon him the curse which the Lord sent in the Law, by Moses, on the sons of iniquity. May his name be erased from the book of the living, and not be recorded with the righteous. May his portion and his heritage be with Cain the fratricide, with Dathan and Abiram, with Ananias and Sapphira, with Simon Magus, and with Judas the traitor, and with those who said to God, 'Depart from us, we will not follow thy ways.' MAY ETERNAL FIRE DEVOUR HIM WITH THE DEVIL AND HIS ANGELS, unless he make restitution, and come to amendment. So be it. So be it.

This horrible Curse, which excels even that of Ernulph, is in the 'Roman Pontifical,' restored and edited by order of Clement VIII., p. 160; Antwerp, 1627. No work is of higher authority in the Roman Catholic Church than the 'Pontificale Romanum.'

How very different is the preaching of Him whose benedictions are recorded in the fifth chapter of the Gospel according to St. Matthew. If the fifth chapter of St. Matthew consists of the words of Christ, these Curses must be the words of Antichrist. Light and darkness, love and hate are not more opposed, than is the fifth chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel and the anathema of the Church of Rome.

Can such a system last much longer?

XIII.

THE SITUATION.

THE Pope once promised a sort of reform in the use of both swords when hard pressed by the victorious Eldest Son of the Church in Italy. The Emperor was then weak enough, or charitable enough, to believe the Pope's word, so that he ventured to announce in various shapes, and on different occasions, the certainty of a reformation being consummated in Rome. The Pope heard of so startling a prophecy from the Imperial lips, and forthwith gave notice that it was all moonshine, and that he had no intention of instituting a reform, which would be practically starting a revolution. It is matter of surprise that so sagacious a ruler as the Emperor of the French should have ever imagined that the Pope either will, or can, attempt a reform. His only policy is stern resistance to the most infinitesimal quantity of any such element. He must and will continue as he is, or he must pack up his ecclesiastical vestments and retire.

With great consistency, Pio Nono has announced already that he means to retain all that is ancient and acquired—all the accumulated layers of evil and error, and tyranny and intolerance—and to hand down the sacred deposit to his successors undiluted and unimpaired. This is rather

uncomfortable news, but there is no doubt he means to do so. Every person acquainted with the patrimony of St. Peter, the laws of the Papacy and the foundations on which it rests, knows that it cannot be otherwise. The very law of its existence and continuity is that of addition, never of subtraction — accumulation, not diminution. Infallibility adds new dogmas, but never repents of or repeals old ones. The Papacy is the sedimentary product of a thousand years, each stratum fixed and unalterable, because pronounced Divine by an infallible authority. It must, therefore, stand or fall as a whole. It must flourish over all empires as an inspiration from Heaven, and be held as the everlasting incorporation of righteousness and truth, and love and peace; or it must go down as a millstone sinks into the sea, and disappear amid the winds and waves of the last storm of retribution. We cannot eliminate, or improve, or reform it. For the Pope to attempt to do so would be suicide.

A very lucid and argumentative letter was once addressed to the Pope by Cavour, which sounded like a notice to reform or to quit. It was evidently the expression of feelings that at length had become irrepressible. It was a *résumé* of facts that are undeniable, clothed in language worthy of one who would spare the feelings of an aged and obstinate priest, and yet dare not withhold the unpalatable truths which faithfulness to his country and still surviving devotion to the Romish faith required him to repeat. There is some reason for believing that the exposition of the statesman received the approbation of the Emperor. But the Pope did not and never will consent to any such arrangement as that proposed. He will not denude himself of his sovereignty, or further degrade his position as a ruler, become the pensioner of Europe, and cease to be any

longer the brother of its sovereigns. He will clutch the tiara while he has life, and perish in the nearing convulsion or be swept away on the hurricane, when unable any longer to remain in that capital with which his fate—if he be the Antichrist of the Apocalypse—is intimately connected. The whole prestige of the Papacy arises from Rome being, as alleged by it, the See of St. Peter, and the chair being traditionally the throne of the apostle. Heretics who reason know that St. Peter, if historic evidence has any force, never was at Rome, or pretended to be Bishop of Rome—or even dreamed, as far as we may judge from his writings, of becoming supreme Pontiff of Christendom. The chair which tradition pronounces to have been his throne has been proved to be an old Mahometan chair, in which some sensual Moslem enjoyed his repose, or, if tobacco was then used, smoked his chibouque. But the Church has decided against history and evidence, and has transubstantiated Peter into Pope, and the Moslem seat into an apostolic throne. This is the capital on which she draws for the support of her lofty claims and insolent pretensions; and the removal of the Pope from the sight and objects of so inveterate traditions would dim his glory in a fearful degree, and reduce the "seven thunders" that used to hurtle over Europe into the mimic sounds of a provincial playhouse.

Had he consented to remain in Rome on the terms proposed by Italy some years ago, his conscious degradation would have been intolerable. The Archbishop of Canterbury reduced to the rank of a third-rate Nonconformist minister would be nothing to the administrator of empires, the sovereign of a capital rich in the most ancient and brilliant traditions, the regal head and fountain of law, reduced to the condition of a stipendiary priest,

retaining, in fact, his spiritualities, but stripped of the power of compelling their effects. Such a measure carried into law would cripple the Papacy just where its power is dearest and most vital. As long as the Pope retains civil and political jurisdiction, he can consign his victims to the dens of St. Angelo, the guardianship of *sbirri* and gaolers, and chastise vigorously every heretic that comes within the sweep of his arm. This is the power that the Court of Rome feels is essential to its independence. The loss of the States of the Church, or the subjection of Rome as the capital of Italy to a constitutional king, would be the loss of historic glory, and so far the Pope mourns over the prospect of such a calamity. But the real loss would be the utter inability under which he would lie of inflicting penal retributions for spiritual offences. His thunders might be heard, but the bolts that shattered, and the lightning that scathed would be no more. On the banks of the Tiber, and under the shadow of St. Peter, priests might renounce his supremacy, and yet be exposed to neither imprisonment nor torture. Heretics from England might preach there, and distribute Bibles and tracts, and laugh at the excommunications of an impotent old priest. Gavazzi might then speak in Italy as in England, and challenge the Pope, now that he can no longer burn him by way of answering his arguments. The gist of the Vatican's fears and obstinacy lies here. A spiritual officer can inflict spiritual censures only, and wield spiritual weapons only. This, as applied to the Pope, is neither more nor less than the removal of his fagots, the destruction of his lucifers, the opening of his prison-doors, the breaking of his best sword; and, what is worse, the development of liberty of conscience, and freedom of speech and writing. The papal system rests on base material things. It can-

not long survive their extinction. Free discussion in Rome, or in the Vatican Council, is death to the Papacy. It lives by its repression—it dies under it. We pity the sorrows of a poor old man, but we would rejoice at his removal in the interest of religion, humanity, and truth. Protestantism, on the contrary, courts discussion—it asks for an open field and fair play. Strong in its convictions, confident in its origin, and sure of its success, it spurns the fire, and the prison, and the police, as means of maintaining or spreading its tenets. Bribes and bayonets are not found in its arsenal. Prisons and gibbets are not its weapons. It will not call on the civil power to punish those that desert its fold, or compel the unconvinced to enter it. Conviction cannot be produced by force. An ally so procured is weakness, not strength, and is far more dangerous than an open foe. But this is not the judgment of Antonelli and the College of Cardinals, or of Pius IX. and his Ultramontane advisers. As Romanists they are perfectly right in this persuasion. Their religion, condemned in the New Testament in the clearest terms, and proved during the lapse of many years, and on the most undisturbed field for the experiment, not only a failure but a calamity, requires pomp and splendour to conceal its inherent corruption, and force and fraud to uphold its tremendous pretensions. Its heads, therefore, tremble for the safety of the Church, when these buttresses are removed. They cannot afford to lose them. They will not let them go unless by the appliance of a force they cannot resist, or in the throes of an earthquake, from which they will seek to escape for their lives. It is only a question of time, not of doubtful issue.

The Abbé Passaglia, a conscientious Roman Catholic, lifted up an ominous protest against the

temporal power of the Papacy, which must be classed among the auguries and omens of nearing destruction. Voices indeed appear to be lifted up in all directions protesting against one or other portion of the Papacy. It is the aggregate that is prophetic of doom; and the Œcumenical Council of 1869 must serve to precipitate but it will not avert the catastrophe.

The Abbé is the farthest possible from Protestantism. He is still zealous for the Papacy. He thinks, however, that the powers inherent in the Church are repressed and her glory tarnished by her being mixed up with temporal estates—secular functions and earthly cares. He therefore proposed the last and only likely stroke for the existence of the Church—that she should at once disentangle herself from the cares of property, and that her priests should cease to "invade the limits of other men, and to put their sickles to harvests not their own"—that they should confine their power to sins, not to temporal possessions, seeing it is on account of sins, and not for the sake of temporalities, that they have received the keys of the kingdom of heaven to shut out, not lawful owners from their lands, but obstinate sinners from heaven.

His sketch of the moral ruin of the whole Church in Italy gives plain evidence that the "Lady of Kingdoms" has fallen, and that the hour of retribution has overtaken her:—

"But now let me ask what is the appearance of Christian congregations in most districts of Italy? Do they show forth, in fact, the spectacle of people united to their priests, of flocks adhering to their pastors? And how can this happy issue ever take place if the priests and the pastors grow day by day more severed from their flocks? . . . . What are we to think of the churches of Italy? Shall we

regard them as nothing but shadows of things that once have been—mere phantom outlines which probably will perish step by step, unless the bishops and pastors set their feet as soon as possible on the path of concord? And that," he adds, "they will do forthwith, if they call to mind, that they are the representatives of Him who came to save that which was lost, and who laid down His life for His sheep."

While he thus delineates the progress of the ploughshare among the pastures of Pio Nono all over Italy, he states and enumerates the naked facts which Pio Nono seems resolved to wage war with, as with inveterate heretics. All Italy decided for Victor Emmanuel. The priests shouted their *vivas* in harmony with the people. Italy is now one united kingdom with or without the Pope. The Papacy is at war with facts—accomplished facts. In vain, however, do they thunder in the hearing of the Pope. He says they are myths, and if facts "*non possumus*," we cannot accept them. Passaglia implores him to admit for once the evidences of the senses, or face the certainty of perishing in his delusions:—"For, from the provinces which lie at the foot of the Alps, down to the parts about Sicily, the name of Victor Emmanuel is now the one only sound that strikes the ear; all provinces, cities, and villages are ruled beneath his united sway; almost all the Italian race is represented in the National Assembly, and passes laws for the public benefit; there is one administration to which alone all taxes are paid; everywhere it is the united prayer of all men that Italy may flourish in its new political unity, and may grow independent, and gather strength thereby. If," he adds, "you imitate the wisdom of Christ, and ask 'whose is the image and superscription' on every

coin in Italy, there will be but one answer from all—namely, that the money is stamped with the image of Victor Emmanuel, King of Italy; you will find that there is one united army, which looks to the internal tranquillity and to the external defence of the realm; and finally, that England, France, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, America, and other noble and powerful nations, already treat the Kingdom of Italy as a new and fortunate star, auguring for her a bright and happy future, associating with her on the terms of diplomatic intercourse, and allying themselves with Italy by those ordinary bonds which the use and law of nations have rendered venerable and sacred. Either, then," he concludes, "nothing in the world is certain, or else it is more than certain that the Kingdom of Italy is no longer a visionary and distant scheme to be longed for and desired, but an actual and inexorable fact."

These are inexorable facts. The Pope, however, is an inexorable unbeliever in them. These things, he alleges, ought not to be, and therefore I will not believe that they are. I would kill them, but as this is impossible, I will disown and deny them and treat them as nonentities. He is infallible in his doctrinal decisions. He claims to be infallible in his decisions of what are facts and what are not facts. He thus exposes his lofty pretensions to an ordeal which the most illiterate peasant can appreciate, and precipitates a ruin which the most enthusiastic Protestant must rejoice in, but never ventured to anticipate so soon. Earnestly and sincerely does the Abbé implore the Pope to mend his manners and save the Church.

"But what," he continues in paragraph 73, "is the nature of this rule, that comes to us propped up by such an amount of Papal authority? In which

direction does it look? What meaning does it disclose? In what terms is it couched? Setting aside all circumlocution, I answer, in plain, simple terms, the rule is this:—That the interests of the Church, the salvation of souls, and the duty imposed upon all pastors from Heaven, demands that, setting aside all questions of political controversy, and leaving to their own sphere all debated questions of human law and right, peace shall be made by the Church with those kingdoms which exist *de facto*, and which are flourishing in actual possession; and further, that to such kingdoms nothing shall be refused which tends to promote Christian communion and intercourse."

This is too good sense to be tolerated in the Vatican. It is the very last thing we Protestants want the Pope to do. Were he to listen to it, the Papal imposture might renew its lease, prolong its power, and give the Protestants new trouble. The Pope seems to have made up his mind to flourish in all the glory of Hildebrand, or to go down like a ship in full sail. This last is no doubt his fate. The sure word of prophecy, as accepted by all interpreters, predicts it, and, therefore, steadily the drama proceeds to its last act.

The Abbé sums up the requirements of the age and the duties of the Pontiff in these eloquent words:—

"Forsooth, if ever exigencies of times and seasons, and of civil society, appeared to demand that a temporal headship should be joined on to the office of the Supreme Pontiff, the face of all things in Europe, both public and private, is now so thoroughly changed, that nothing can be more to be desired, even for the Pope himself, than that his sceptre should be severed from his keys, and the episcopal mitre from his kingly crown. This separation is

loudly and unanimously demanded by all those who are reluctantly and unwittingly kept by foreign arms in subjection to the Pontifical kingdom; it is demanded, as with one voice, by the entire people of Italy, who vow that they can no longer endure that their newly-founded kingdom shall be deprived of Rome as its metropolis and ancient head. And their demands are seconded by all the most polished nations of Europe, who are thoroughly convinced that nothing but the greatest misfortunes redound to the Papacy and to the cause of religion itself from this temporal supremacy; and finally, these requests are more strongly urged by the dangers which hang over the Church and civil society at large—dangers which cannot be averted unless the Pope will choose to turn his mind to the counsels of peace, unity, and concord. And further, the abandonment of the temporal headship is demanded by the duty of the supreme pastor of the Church himself, whose duty extends to the advantage and profit of his whole flock. It is demanded, in fine, by human and Divine laws."

The result of such candour is obvious. The Abbé was threatened with excommunication, and subjected to showers of Pontifical curses. Nevertheless, nearly 10,000 priests petitioned the Pope to divest himself of his temporalities and to become a spiritual officer. The Cardinals may burn Passaglia, but his words, and those recent protests of Hyacinthe, are lighting a fire in which the bark of St. Peter, now high and dry on the beach, will be burned to ashes.

We read in the pages of a late Arctic traveller, that one day a huge mass of ice on which a large bear was seated, quietly licking his paws, broke off from the mainland, and was borne away on the current in a southern direction. The bear howled

terribly as soon as he discovered his position, appealing from every side of his ice-craft for the interposition of a deliverer. But no friend was at hand, and steadily the ice drifted towards the sun, dissolving every hour. In vain the lone voyager on his lessening float appealed to air, ocean, and ice for a friend.

Somewhat similar to this is the situation of the Pope of Rome. Insensible to the perils of his condition, and believing that all would continue as heretofore, he took no steps to conciliate his enemies or reform his conduct. At length the waves of that deep sea that now sweeps over Italy, struck the crazy Popedom, and set loose the Papacy like the iceberg of the Arctic regions, with Pio Nono adrift and alone. As he nears the sun, the light of which he heartily hates, and as he feels his raft melting into the element from which it came, he sends forth the most piteous howls. One day he wastes his strength in cursing Victor Emmanuel; another day, but with "bated breath," he upbraids Napoleon. Anon, he calls in loud and piercing *Misereres* on all the Catholic kings of the earth, as they value their thrones and lives, to come to his help. As if his prophetic instincts warned him that an echo was more likely to return than an answer, he turned to his last refuge, the saints in his Pantheon. But none of them seem willing to interfere. There are "winking" virgins, "weeping" virgins, "sweating" virgins; but, notwithstanding this variety, they are deaf to the appeals and entreaties of him who at last feels himself and his throne *in extremis*. Poor unhappy Pope! Lamoriciere is gone, the Irish recruits are prisoners or fugitives, the King of Naples has absconded, his dungeons have been laid bare and are broken up, the Œcumenical Council is deplored by his friends and wel-

comed by his enemies; and the Pope, like the bear on the iceberg, is carried toward the sun, and both Pope and Papacy are dissolving in the light and warmth of a climate they were not made to flourish in.

What adds to the sadness of the situation, few seem to pity the unhappy old priest. Many of his flock prefer the wolf Garibaldi to the shepherd Pio Nono, and the pen of Emmanuel to the fold of the venerable shepherd. Should not this suggest to the chief pastor, now in his agony, the possibility that the pastures on which he has fed them may not have been of the purest and freshest sort, and that something must have gone wrong in a professedly Christian country, where the advent of Diodati's Bible is set down as a new and startling phenomenon?

There used to be in England bishops *in partibus* previous to the Papal aggression. It really seems likely, should Pio Nono escape from his deliquescent float by the appearance of some friendly craft, that henceforth we shall have a Pope *in partibus* likewise. Were the Papacy, in the most elemental sense, a blessing—had it tried to inspire into men's souls nobler and purer motives of action, or beneficently penetrated their hearts, or transformed those it touched with its many hands into better men, we should so far regret its ruin. But let us listen for one moment to the millions of Italian beating hearts; let us watch the smouldering flame of passion, lust, revenge, that smokes and burns within them; let us note the foul thoughts that nestle there, or flit from heart to heart like dark spectres, or fan with untiring wings the embers not yet extinguished. What has Romanism done to change these? What successful effort has it made to repress them? It has played with them, profited

by them, connived at them, absolved them; but all the while they have grown into ranker and more deadly luxuriance. As often as the light has sought to penetrate the misty air, it has been diverted or darkened by a priesthood who prefer the darkness to light because their deeds are evil. Rome has a brilliant past. The fields of ancient battles, the shrines of holy martyrdoms, the arena of eloquent debates are there. But its present is humiliating and shameful. It has been weighed and found wanting. It is impotent for good. It is fit only to be cast out and buried. This is its doom written in that Book whose prophecies never failed.

This is the conviction and the feeling of the wisest and best of mankind. Nor shall we lament the nearing fate of the Papacy. Were we so weak, our recollections would rush back to Smithfield, the Inquisition, and the Alps — there to gather the proof of the Apocalyptic brand on her brow, "drunk with the blood of saints," and thence to return, kindling every feeling within us into hatred of a system which, under the holy name of the Prince of Peace, has perpetrated such crimes and cruelties. It would appear that the words of Daniel are now passing out of phophecy into history. "The judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion to consume and destroy it to the end." But when that system has set in everlasting night, and the traces of its crimes are overflowed by the waters of judgment, true religion will only shine forth with augmented splendour. "The kingdom and dominion and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey Him."

A Christian has no fear about the approaching

issue, as he has no misgivings about the merits of the old priest who is at present Supreme Pontiff. One sits and rules high above the tide-marks of this troubled European sea. The deluge of superstition and of evil that has swept over the earth so long, will soon ebb. All that is worthless will be washed away, and from a new Ararat the incense of worship and the accents of song will ascend to heaven, and around it the seeds of righteousness will spring up, and the "deserts of the earth will rejoice, and her solitary places blossom as the rose."

Evil and error hold in their bosoms the elements of their own destruction. Truth is victory, and hers is the heritage of eternal peace.

What a testimony to the depth to which the Papacy has penetrated the life of nations, that its nearing fall should convulse Italy, France, Austria, and Spain! It seems to have grown up like a parasite ivy-plant, apparently deriving its nutriment from its roots, but really from the various structures it seemed to shelter, while it exhausted and destroyed them. Clearly, it cannot stand alone. It must be shored up or it must fall. Yet Cabinets seem to dread its standing or its falling, and numbers who would strike are paralyzed by those who would depend, and more who see its necessary and inevitable decay if left to itself are afraid to stand aloof, lest while it fulfils its doom, it drag to destruction those into the interstices and crannies of whose life it has sent its creepers and tendrils. It is unquestionably a mystery, but not of godliness; it is also a power, but not for good. Its treatment must at this moment be a terrible perplexity to Louis Napoleon. His hatred of it as a power for evil, as long as it lives, induces him to do all he can to consume it. His dread of a convulsion in France—the waves of which may wash away his dynasty—alone prevents

him giving it a final blow. He therefore keeps his troops around the Vatican, and silences, while he cannot conciliate, the Episcopacy of France, with the exception of the mitre of Orleans, which all the waters of the Tiber cannot cool.

The 'Siècle' renewed a proposition—for some time, it is supposed, entertained even at the Vatican—that the Pope should emigrate to Jerusalem. His friends clearly become fewer, his troubles increase, and the prospect of being left alone without a Gallican bayonet has become intolerable. It seems sound advice. The air of Palestine is at least as balmy as that of Italy. The geographical situation is more central. Living is as cheap; lodging is not bad: and an aged bachelor, such as Pio Nono is, does not stand in need of a splendid establishment, or princely retinue, or greater luxuries than Jerusalem can afford. His personal safety may be easily guaranteed. The Bedouins of the desert and the Arab troopers will have some reverence—not unmixed with some compassion—for an emigrant of such mark. For his blessing pronounced from Mount Zion or Olivet—surely of greater efficacy from such hallowed spots than from the western window of a modern cathedral—the pilgrims of the desert, the weary-footed wanderers of Palestine, and especially the monks and nuns, will not refuse many a handsome gratuity. As a stroke of policy it may be worth while. His emigration is not a question, but a dire necessity. His removal to Jerusalem may spare his dignity, and turn a calamity to good account, and shed its greatest splendour on the decadence of Papal domination. Better a voluntary and dignified retreat to the "City of the Great King," than another forced and livery-clad flight to Civita Vecchia. The prestige that clings to Jerusalem, like the unspent rays of the glory that dwelt

between the cherubim—the sacredness of a soil on which so many and so memorable scenes have occurred—the place which the discrowned capital holds in the veneration of Moslem, Monk, and Protestant—all plead its claims, its superior claims, to the presence of one who professes so sublime a mission and is the victim of so dire a necessity.

Others say the Pope once had, if not now, serious intentions of emigrating to London. Supposing this to have been the purpose of the Vatican, it is evident that the party most benefited would be the Pope himself. Unable any longer to endure the heat of Rome, he finds Jerusalem full of troubles and Syria of red trousers; Austria for ever gone, Bavaria a victim, France almost apostate, and Spain in the throes of a revolution; and London the only quiet capital on earth. The weary old man naturally thinks his old bones may enjoy a little rest where the waves of the troubled sea of Europe do not come. The change would no doubt benefit his health, and in some degree the quiet would heal that heart which, he tells us in his pastorals, has been so frequently grieved and broken.

He will find the slums of Westminster at least as clean as the streets of Rome, and old Father Thames rather better than the yellow Tiber. What he long feared and deprecated at Rome—gas lamps, and railways, and newspapers—he will find to be perfectly harmless, if not positively useful, in London. To his amazement, he will learn it is possible to bless and curse, wash pilgrims' feet, and baptize Jews, with the presence of a few policemen instead of a regiment of soldiers to keep the ground. He may see among us the amplest toleration of every sect that does not break the law of the land, while in his present capital the English chapel is an old granary outside the Porta del Popolo, and its service is interdicted within

the walls of the sacred capital, lest its infection might taint the air or injure the orthodoxy of his children. He may be led to appreciate our generosity by noticing a Roman Catholic pro-cathedral in Moorfields, and another in Westminster, and, should he feel so disposed, he may build a third in Brompton. The only restriction he may feel—and we admit the inconvenience—will be, that he will be prevented imprisoning a too zealous Protestant, or shutting up a church or chapel in which his pretensions may have been canvassed. The Pope, like Balaam on Zophim, may feel the breath of a better inspiration, and bless those he has been wont to curse.

But his condition, however improved, cannot arrest the final catastrophe. It is Divinely written. The least word God has spoken will endure. The mightiest structure error can raise must fall.

XIV.

PROBABLE DATE OF HER FALL.

Is there any indication in the prophetic page, so far as we can decypher it, that the fall of Babylon is near? May we not reverently inquire and humbly suggest, without exposing our investigations to censure, or laying ourselves open to charges of dogmatism?

Ancient and many modern writers think it probable that each day of the creation week was the symbol in miniature of a thousand years; that as six days were expended by the Creator in arranging and furnishing our world for the introduction of the dynasty of man, and the seventh day was specially consecrated as the sabbath or rest; so six thousand years will be expended—a day for a thousand years—in the working of our present mundane economy, and the seventh thousand year will inaugurate the sabbatical rest of a thousand years, or what the apostle calls the σαββατισμος, or sabbath keeping, "that remaineth for the people of God."

There is a pertinent and illustrative case recorded in Leviticus xxvi., verses 18, 21, 24, and 28. God, it is there written, will afflict Israel "seven times." In four different instances recorded in the course of that chapter, He declares He will afflict them "seven times." This reiteration of the word "times" re-

minds one of the great Apocalyptic period, "time, times, half a time;" and the question, "Wilt thou *at this time* restore the kingdom to Israel?" and "The Jews shall be trodden under foot, until *the times of the Gentiles* be fulfilled." During these "seven times" God will afflict His people, Jerusalem will be trodden under foot, and the Jews will be a scoff and a by-word. After the end of these "seven times" the Gentile oppression will cease; and God's now forsaken but yet unforgotten race will as a nation arrange for and inaugurate their return to Jerusalem.

In Daniel viii. 14, we read of 2300 days; beginning at the destruction of "the ram," that is, the Persian empire, achieved by the "he goat," or the Greek; the end of which period of 2300 years will be followed by certain great events. It is shown that a "day" means a year, by an investigation of the 70 weeks of Daniel's prophecy, already exhausted. These 70 weeks in Daniel's prophecy, and in chapter ix. 27, have already been fulfilled. We can therefore and thereby prove that the prophet uses a prophetic day for a literal year. Thus the 70 weeks are 70 times 7 days—that is, 490 prophetic days, or 490 literal years. During "time, times, and half a time," says Daniel in chapter vii. verse 25 of his prophecy, a great apostate power which he minutely delineates shall afflict the people of God; a power that "wears out the saints," "changes times and laws;" God's people will be given into its hand to be persecuted by it for "a time, times, and the dividing of times." At the end of this epoch, whatever be its duration, or its exhaustion, "the judgment shall sit," "his dominion shall be taken away," and he will be consumed until the end, when he shall be utterly destroyed by the brightness of Christ's coming."

We shall find in the Book of Revelation several periods of precisely the same duration differently

expressed. Thus we read the holy city, the picture of the true Church, is to be trodden under foot *forty and two months.* If we multiply 42 by 30, we find the product is 1260 days—*i. e.*, 1260 literal years. Again: "I will give power to my two witnesses; they shall prophecy in sackcloth;" that is, the true Church shall be depressed and crushed by this dominant power, "one thousand two hundred and three score days:" that is, 1260 symbolic days, or literal years. In Revelation, 12th chapter, the woman flees into the wilderness; that is, the Church of Christ escapes into obscurity, where she shall be nourished a thousand two hundred and threescore days. If we analyse these periods, "time, times, and half a time," or 1260 days, or 42 months, we shall find they all denote one period; a time, 360 prophetic days, or full literal years; times, double that number, twice 360; and half a time, the half of 360; making exactly 1260 prophetic days, or 1260 literal and full chronological years. Thus all these representative dates—namely, the "time, times, half a time," the "42 months," the "1260 days"—all denote and mete out the same duration. In Daniel, the 12th chapter, we read of 30 days added to the 1260, making 1290 days. He also adds a yet further period of 45 days to the 1290; and he predicts that the man will be blessed, or specially happy, or the possessor of great joy, who lives to the close of these three united periods, forming 1335 years. These dates, or calculations, the Spirit has inspired; we do not invent them. If we cannot remove every difficulty in solving and applying them, it is our duty to do the best we can. There are some topics on which one can speak with absolute conviction that one speaks the very mind and words and truths of God; there are other topics more delicate, more intricate, on which one must speak with reserve; in

investigating which it is possible we may be wrong, and in some instances it may be probable we have not arrived at the true and exhaustive solution.

But in this instance are we justified in interpreting a *day* in prophecy as representative of a *year* in history? When one draws a plan of a farm, or an estate, he writes below: "on the scale of an inch for a mile;" so that every inch upon the plan represents a mile upon the literal estate. After the same plan every day in these dates in the prophetic page represents a year in the currency of time. The proof of this interpretation lies in such expressions as these. Moses says: "All the *days* that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty *years*;" here days and years are used convertibly. Laban says to Jacob: "Fulfil her *week;* the service thou shalt serve will be yet *seven years.*" Here seven years are called a week of seven days; and therefore seven days represent seven years. In Leviticus we read: "Thou shalt number seven sabbaths of years." He is speaking of the jubilee; seven times seven make forty-nine days; but he calls them sabbaths, or weeks of years. The jubilee occurred every fiftieth year. In these passages a day is used as strictly representative of a year. In Numbers xiv. 34: "After the number of the days in which ye searched the land, even forty days, each day for a year," &c. The prophecy of Ezekiel is still more remarkable. Ezekiel is told by God: "Lie upon thy left side, for I have laid on thee the iniquity of the house of Israel, according to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days; and when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right side, and thou shalt bear the iniquities of the house of Jacob forty days. I have appointed thee each day for a year." Nothing can be more conclusive; the prophet symbolically is made to lie on his side, to represent a national estate or condition; and

God tells him expressly that each day of his personal reclining represents a year. Sir Isaac Newton, Bishop Newton, Shimeall, Elliott, Bickersteth, and Villiers are therefore fully justified in understanding, by a prophetic day, a literal year; and therefore in interpreting these great dates after the law which we have now endeavoured to lay down.

But it has been objected, at the very outset of such investigations, that God has expressly said to Daniel, "Shut up the words, and seal the book;" which means, it is not to be understood, "even to the time of the end." This is perfectly true. The question remains, Has the seal been broken? Is the time of the end come? Or are we trying, when we venture to explain these great themes, to break seals which God has not broken, to penetrate mysteries which He has not explained, and to cast our inquiring glance into a future which God has sealed and shut up from the inspection and the penetration of the most gifted of mankind? If so, we are doing what is wrong. But let us inquire, in the words of Scripture, "What or what manner of times the Spirit of Christ which was in them did signify when he testified beforehand of the sufferings of Christ, and of the glory that should follow." Daniel's inhibition was clearly operative, when the apostles asked our Saviour, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom?" for His answer was: "It is not for you to know the times and the seasons;" the word *times* evidently referring to the "times" of the Gentiles in Leviticus, and the "times" of Daniel; "which the Father has put in his own power; but power shall be given you from on high." He sends them, in other words, on their immediate mission. He does not rebuke them for their inquiry, as if it were an idle one; but He informs them that the seal was not yet broken, that they had before them a great and pressing work it

was their first duty to accept. One apostle, John, outlived the rest. John was banished a prisoner by Domitian to the isle of Patmos. What the other apostles did not know, and what it was not time for them to receive, was revealed expressly to John in Patmos. Referring to the very words of Daniel, "Seal the book even to the time of the end," the voice from heaven sounded in the ear of John, "Seal not the book, for the Lion of the tribe of Judah hath prevailed to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof." This means that the sealing, which was commanded in Daniel's days, was undone in John's day; and that we are warranted, not in prophesying, which belongs to him that wears a prophet's mantle and has a prophet's mission, but in exploring and according to the measure of our success explaining the prophecy of a once sealed but now unsealed book; for "Blessed is he that readeth and they that hear the words of this prophecy."

Let us turn for illustration to the earliest dates recorded in the 26th chapter of Leviticus, at the 18th verse. God, speaking to the Jews, and to them only, declares: "If ye will not yet for all this hearken unto me, then I will punish you seven times more for your sins." In the 19th verse he fixes the date when the seven times of punishment should begin. "I will break the pride of your power;" that is, you shall descend from your greatness, and shall cease to be a grand nation. He varies the voice of judgment in the 24th verse: "Then will I also walk contrary unto you, and will punish you yet seven times for your sins." And in the 28th verse he almost repeats the words: "And I, even I, will chastise you seven times for your sins."

When and at what year did the seven times begin? If we can fix this, we can easily show when and in what year the seven times terminated. When did this

threatened affliction on the Jews as a nation begin; and when, therefore, may we expect that infliction upon the Jews as a nation will cease? The first announcement was made on the completion of the tabernacle, a year after the exodus. Multiply 360 years, that is, a "time," by seven, and we arrive at the duration of God's national affliction of the Jews by the hands of the Gentiles, or the seven times suffering of the Jewish people. So multiplied it amounts to exactly 2520 years. Our first and most important inquiry now is, When did these 2520 years begin? God says it would begin at the time when he would "break the pride of their power." When did this destruction of national greatness take place? The ten tribes were made tributary, as is well known, after the dismemberment of the kingdom, under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, but the remaining two tribes retained their distinct and independent existence till the time of Manasseh. The captivity of Judah, under Manasseh, took place A.M. 3480. If we add to 3480 A.M., or the year of the world, the period of intervening time before Christ, 652; and also add A.D., or the year 1870, it will make exactly 6002 years; and therefore the end of the 6000 years that constitute the world's week, previous to the sabbatical rest or millenial sabbath. In other words and form, if to the year of the world, or Anno Mundi, 3480, when the pride of Judah was broken, we add the seven times, or 2520 years, we shall find that it exceeds, by two, 6000 years. If so, the affliction of the Jews should determine about this time, the Gentile oppression of them come to an end, and Jerusalem soon cease to be trodden under foot. One may be wrong by a year or two in this estimate of the commencement of the date; but that the sands of our present mundane economy are nearly run out is, I think, certain. I give data; I

refuse to decide. Daniel under another figure, and applicable in another, but no less corroborative way, refers to the very same period, in speaking of Nebuchadnezzar reduced to the level of the beasts of the earth. If this account were literal, personal, and applicable only to him, of course the prophetic interpretation could not be sustained. But certain phrases employed by the sacred writer indicate that the seven times of Nebuchadnezzar's mania relate to and shadow forth something larger, and cover a vaster area than the limits of the life of that monarch. He says: "Let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beast's heart be given unto him; and let seven times pass over him;" the usual prophetic symbols. Primarily, no doubt, this relates to the personal madness of the Babylonish king; but as it is connected with a series of symbols, and very remarkable symbols too, which continue during the whole period of the four great monarchies, it is reasonable to infer, from the words employed, that the "seven times," if it has a literal and limited application to the person, encloses also a larger application to the wide world and to the history of mankind. For instance, it is said: "The height of the tree reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to all the earth;" "Leave the stump of the roots thereof in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass"—these words signify prolonged duration. The colossal image, which foretokens the fall of the four great monarchies, the kingdom of gold and silver and iron and brass, is also associated with and mixed up with this remarkable judgment pronounced upon the Babylonian king. And therefore we read that, "in the days of these kings the God of heaven shall set up a kingdom which shall break in pieces and consume all other kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever and ever." These expressions indicate that

the "seven times" meting out the duration of Nebuchadnezzar's mania is merely a representative epitome, setting forth the seven times during which the kings of the earth are to continue as they now are. When did the seven times of Daniel begin? We discover from an expression used by the inspired historian, that they are the same seven times Moses refers to. The inspired historian merges Zedekiah, who was carried to Babylon, and dates the sufferings of Israel from Manasseh. Now hear his words: "Surely at the commandment of the Lord came this on Judah, to remove them out of his sight, for the sins"—not of Zedekiah, he is a personal and immediate instrument—but "for the sins of Manasseh." That brings us to what we brought out in Leviticus, the date at which the pride of the power of that nation was broken was in the days of Manasseh. We begin, therefore, Daniel's commencement of his seven times at A.M. 3480; we add the years before Christ, 652; and then the year 1870 of the Christian economy or dispensation added to that brings it to 6002 years, at the end of which period Judah shall begin to be restored. God will remember his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and bring them back to their own land, and they shall look upon him whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn as one in bitterness for his first-born.

Let us turn to another date, and see if we can cast light upon it, namely, the 2300 prophetic days, or, strictly and properly, literal years. In the 8th chapter of Daniel, at the 13th verse, we read: "I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot?"—he is speaking of the Jewish people. How long

shall they be trodden under foot?—how long shall there be no sacrifice, no true religion, among that race? His answer is not a period at the end of which the Jews shall be restored, but a period at the end of which the sanctuary shall be cleansed, or, as it might be translated, shall be justified; and after the exhaustion of this period we should expect to see some preparation for the return of the Jews, the restoration of Palestine and Jerusalem, and for God's ancient people returning once more to their own land.

When did the 2300 years begin? At the time when the two-horned ram put forth his whole strength against the Greek he-goat, and was broken. Xerxes was humbled, and the Asiatic Greeks emancipated; for Daniel is speaking of these four great empires under their respective dynastic figures; that is to say, the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Greek, and the Roman empires. It was about the year B.C. 480-481 that this took place, it may be a year sooner or later; much more or much less it cannot possibly be. Assuming it was 481, add 2300 years to 481 years B.C., and the product is 2781; that is, the year A.D. 1821. Do we find anything occurring in the eastern kingdom at all tending to justify the inference that the sanctuary at least began then to be cleansed? What is it that now pollutes the sanctuary? Who is now in possession of Palestine? What is the great dominant power that triumphs in the east, and prevents the possibility of the national restoration of the Jews? Take this in connection with the sixth vial, where we are told that the sixth vial was poured out upon the great river Euphrates, which is the symbol of the Turkish power, that started on its conquering march into Europe from the banks of the Euphrates; and "the waters thereof came to be dried up;" that is, the Turco-Moslem

power began to recede, like a flood that had overflowed Palestine and eastern Europe; in order that the way for "kings," or royal ones, "from the sunrising," might be prepared. These kings from the sunrising are God's ancient people, His kings and His priests ceremonially, as Christians are spiritually. Connect these two predictions, and the inference seems to me fair, that about 1821 we should expect to see at least the first initial receding of the Euphratean flood, and the sanctuary which has lain under that great flood of superstition beginning to emerge, and to get ready for the restoration of God's ancient people. Has anything, then, taken place tending to justify this interpretation? In 1821, or about the end of 1820, the Greek Insurrection took place; and the whole of that ancient realm broke loose from the dominion of the Sultan. Euphratean water was thus dried up. In 1827 was fought the battle of Navarino. From 1821 to the present year Bosnia, Wallachia, Moldavia, Algiers, in succession, like great land-slips, have fallen off from the dominion of the Sultan. We find the very peculiarities of Mahometanism ceasing daily, even the dress of the ladies becoming European; the Sultan visiting Europe and conforming to European habits; the Janissaries, the peculiar soldiers of the Turks, utterly annihilated; and English banks, English capital, English newspapers, English railroads, English tastes, and steamships penetrating the realms of the Sultan. In 1854 our country resolved to support Turkey; not that we loved Mahometanism, but because Turkey was a wall—a very frail one—between us and a supposed hostile invasion of our Eastern empire by the gigantic autocrat, whose shadow spreads over China; whose influence, it is said, may be traced in India; whose destiny, if I understand prophecy, is yet sublime and portentous. Our well-meant attempt in 1854-1856,

to prevent Turkey being destroyed, or, to use the Apocalyptic language, to prevent the Euphratean flood from being too soon evaporated, was not successful. We have simply hastened the decay of Turkey. The Crescent and its dominion are at the present moment nearer exhaustion than at any former period of its history. Lamartine says: "The Ottoman empire is no empire now at all; its breath of life, religious fanaticism, is extinct; and Turkey"—to use his memorable saying—"is literally perishing from want of Turks."

The 2300 years expired, as already stated, about the end of 1821. Accordingly the Crescent, under which Palestine is still a suffering province, began to wane and to relax its tenacious grasp. It is fact that more Jews have returned to Jerusalem during the last twenty years than during 1800 previous years. Enlightened Jews say that if the Messiah do not come speedily, they will give up their hope altogether; that they believe the time has arrived when He ought to come; and that if He do not come, they will part with their expectation of the Messiah. It has been stated that, for the first time, the fountains of Palestine have begun to overflow with sweet spring water; for the first time the early and the latter rains have returned; for the first time, colonies of Jews have settled in Palestine, cultivating its land, and sending home reports of their progress. All these passing scenes seem excessively like the receding of the Euphratean flood from Syria, or the waning of the Mahometan Crescent there. The instant that Turkey falls—for Constantinople is to Palestine and to the Mahometan empire what Rome is to the Roman Catholic apostate empires—Jerusalem becomes free. It is impossible Mahometan Turkey can last much longer. Under the Sultan are nine millions of professing Christians, and scarcely

three millions of Mahometans in Turkey in Europe. We find also from the daily correspondence of the papers, that the old Mahometans are crossing the Bosphorus in crowds, in order to find a carpet to pray on, and a grave to lie down on in Asia, from whence they came. A daily paper, giving an account of this, says: "The Turks are encamped in Europe" —which is exactly the idea—"and they are rapidly decamping, and returning to their own place again." As soon as the power of the Sultan is broken, Palestine comes up. The Jews have an indefeasible right to it by a charter ancient as the days of Moses, by title-deeds in comparison with which the title-deeds of England's proudest nobility are only of yesterday—they are the people whose land it was, and to whom it is promised:—"I will gather you out of all nations, and will bring you into your own land; and ye shall be to me a people, and I will be to you a God."

Why dwell on this? Because the hour of Israel's restoration is the hour of Rome's final ruin.

Daniel, chapter vii., predicts the appearance of what is called a "little horn"—that is, a reigning power—that "shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times, and the dividing of time." At the end of this portrait he adds: "But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end."

This horn, or power, with the mouth speaking great words against the Most High, wearing out God's people by incessant persecutions, that thinks to change times and laws, forms a literal and exact picture of the Papacy, or great Western Apostasy. The prediction indicates that it is to endure domi-

nant and powerful for a "time, times, and half a time;" that at the end of that period it is not to be struck down at once, but "the judgment shall sit;" its dominion—that is, its domination and ascendancy —shall decay till it be taken away. It shall be consumed gradually, and destroyed at the end. This falls in with what St. Paul tells us of the same apostasy, in Second Thessalonians: "That wicked one whom the Lord shall consune;"—the very words of Daniel—"with the spirit of his mouth, and destroy with the brightness of his coming."

In Revelation xiii. 5, it is said: "There was given unto the beast a mouth speaking great things and blasphemies; and power was given unto him to continue forty and two months." Let us compare Daniel's "little horn" with "the mouth speaking great words against the Most High," and destined to endure "time, times, and half a time," with the Apocalyptic wild beast, who was to speak great things against the Most High, and to endure 1260 days, or 1260 literal years, the very same chronological period; and we have the prophecy of a great apostasy that was to last in a dominant state 1260 years, and at the end of this period to be, as Daniel calls it, consumed, and the judgment to sit on it, but not to be finally destroyed till a period subsequent to that, the period of the second advent. These great periods, then, all resolve themselves into this grand date, 1260 years. The real question for us to settle in considering the fall of Babylon is, When was the terminus *a quo*, or the starting period, of 1260 years? There are two opinions. One period assigned as the terminus *a quo* is, the year when Phocas gave the Pope—unquestionably gave, or, as some think who differ from this view, continued to give the Pope—supreme domination. This period would date at the autumnal equinox of 607. The Emperor at this date

gave the then reigning Bishop of Rome supreme power and autocratic domination. If we add 1260 years to 607, it brings us down to the year 1867. According to this view, therefore, the judgment should sit and Rome steadily waste and wane from this date. The authors and upholders of this understand the 2300 years to begin also at a later period than generally assumed, and to terminate also in 1867. Without discussing possible objections to this calculation, let us turn to that accepted by many eminent writers on prophecy, who are persuaded that the corporate development of this great apostasy began about the year 533. The evidence is this—and it rests with the reader, as a responsible Christian, exercising the right of private judgment, to decide upon the truth of the premises, and therefore on the inferences, whether tenable or not. In the year 533—about the beginning of it—the Emperor Justinian, then reigning, addressed a letter to John the Second, the Bishop of Rome. In this letter, Justinian thus speaks: "We have hastened to bring into subjection, and to unite to the see of your Holiness, all the priests of the whole Eastern Church—your Holiness the head of all the holy Church." If, when the Emperor thus addressed the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, he repudiated these words, the Bishop was so far blameless; but if the Bishop accepted the awful position of head of the Church, and became, and set himself forth, and assumed to be, the autocratic priest that claimed to govern all Churches, then I contend the Emperor gave, and the Pope accepted, that supremacy which became the first great act of apostasy. The Pope replied to the Emperor's letter in these words: "You preserve the reverence of the Roman see, and are subjecting all things to it, and bringing them into union with it; to whose founder, Peter, the charge was given from our Lord's lips—

'Feed my sheep,' which See the Rules of the Fathers, and the Statutes of the Princes, and the much to be honoured expressions of your piety, attest truly to be the Head of all the Churches. Your edict is conformable to apostolic doctrine; I confirm it with my authority." There was the supreme civil power constituting, and the ecclesiastical power accepting, this brand. These letters were not private; they were laws placed in the Statute Book, and became governing laws. They are at this moment found under the title '*De Summa Trinitate.*' Then the saints were given, according to the prophecy, into his hand, and history attests the truth of this. I date the commencement of the 1260 years, or the development of that apostasy which was to speak great things against the Most High, to open its mouth in blasphemy, to wear out the saints, at A.D. 533. Its principles were in the days of Paul, but its corporate development occurred at the end of A.D. 532, or beginning of 533. The most eminent Roman Catholic commentators accept 533 as the date of the recognition of the autocratic power of the Bishop of Rome. If this be a fair solution, let us add 1260 to 533, and it brings us down to 1793. If this be a correct identification of the terminus *ad quod*, we ought to find in 1793 some evidence that the judgment sat, that this great power then began to be consumed, and his dominion, or his tyranny, to abate, and the saints of the Most High to begin to be delivered; for Daniel says: "They shall then," at the close of the 1260 years, "take away his dominion, to consume it and to destroy it, unto the end," which end is still in the future. History attests the decay of the Papacy from that time; her priests were massacred, her monasteries and convents plundered, her shrines rifled, her altars dismantled during, and after, the French Revolution; and, finally, the Code Napoléon, a remarkable and splendid code of laws,

took effect, and produced a change as great as the Novellæ and the Ediet of Justinian did 1260 years before. Accepting these two facts, we find a strong presumptive proof that the judgment then sat, and his dominion then began to be taken away; though, in the language of Daniel, his life was prolonged for a season.

This reduction of the power and the depression of the priests of Romanism throughout Europe steadily increases. There is scarcely a nation on the continent of Europe in which Romanism is not dying out; the only deplorable exception is our own England.

In Paris, in the year 1793, there were five thousand priests. The population of Paris has doubled since that period; there ought, therefore, now to be ten thousand priests; but so entire is the consumption, that the number of its priests at this moment is about nine hundred. What a change from him who made the Emperor of Germany do penance amid the snows and in the trenches before he would give him absolution is the condition of Pius IX.! What a change in him to whom England used to pay Peter's pence, in order to stave off his anathemas! What a change from him who shook the nations! He is now fallen like Lucifer of old, he is become as one of us. Is it not, then, highly probable that the 1260 years began A.D. 533, seeing that the depicted termination of the 1260 years comes to be illustrated so clearly in 1793?

Daniel, in his last chapter, speaks of two additional periods; one of thirty years to be added to the 1260, making 1290; then another period of forty-five, to be added to the 1290, making 1335. Let us add thirty years to 1792, and we land at 1822; and that period again synchronizes with the exhaustion of the 2300 years to which I have previously referred. Let us add forty-five years, as Daniel writes, to the

1290; and it brings us down to 1867 or the beginning of 1868; at which period, if this interpretation be correct, they that arrive are in some sense specially blessed.

Barnabas, the earliest of the Fathers, in the first century, thus writes: "The Lord God will finish all things in 6000 years; in six days — *id est*, 6000 years — shall all things be consummated." Lactantius, the most eloquent and classic of the Fathers, whose Latin is distinguished for classic purity and idiom, says: "Because the works of God were finished in six days, it is necessary that the world should remain in this state six ages, that is, 6000 years." Cyprian, the celebrated Bishop of Carthage, says: "In the creation of the world seven days were spent; and in those seven days 7000 years were figuratively typified." And Bishop Latimer, the great Reformer, says: "The world was ordained of God to continue, as Scripture and all learned men agree, 6000 years." Now these testimonies, to which many others might be added, are at least remarkable for their extent and unanimity; when we connect with the constant use of the number *seven*, as, for instance, six days' creation, culminating in a seventh, the sabbath; seven weeks, or seven times seven, the year of jubilee; the seven lamps, the seven candlesticks, the seven stars, the seven angels, the seven seals; seven being the symbol, the numerical symbol of perfection. Confirmatory of this we read that Adam was a figure of Christ; and there we have the key to this interpretation, and so far an evidence that it is not a fancy, but a very solid interpretation of Scripture; and lastly we have a hint of it in the passage, "A day with the Lord is as a thousand years," which also has been adduced.

But the world, it is said, has not nearly exhausted

its 6000 years, because if, according to our received chronology, there are before Christ 4000, and after Christ 1870—it is nearly 130 years to the close of the 6000. But it has been ascertained since the time of Usher and the other early chronologists, that an error has been made in the computation of the patriarchal periods; and that our Christian era, now comprehending 1870 years, began, not when we were 4000 years from creation, as in our Bibles, but when we were 4132 years.

The learned Clinton gives A.M. 4138 as the time at which our Christian era began. According to this the 6000 years end about the year 1862. But our Lord's birth took place a year before Herod began his reign; that is, five years before Clinton's date of the Christian era. Shimeall, of New York, in his 'Chronology of Scripture,' and the Rev. B. Saville, in his valuable compilation called 'The First and Second Advent,' have shown that the date of the Christian era, and the true year of the birth of Christ, synchronize in Anno Mundi 4132. If so, the 6000 years ran out in 1868.

If these calculations are just, we are on the eve of stupendous events. Great Babylon rapidly nears her destruction. Her day of power is ended. Her assumptions have provoked the Most High. Her temporary autocracy will introduce her entire and irremediable ruin.

He cometh in the clouds with power and great glory.

He comes, we are told, to punish and destroy His enemies. It is not charity to conceal or explain away this awful end which shall come to us at the Lord's return. "The Lord Jesus shall be revealed from heaven with his mighty angels in flaming fire, taking (yielding) vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus

Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of His power." (2 Thess. i. 7.) The justice of this retribution is found in the fact that its subjects wilfully rejected or corrupted the great salvation. Offered eternal life in the Name of Jesus, they would not accept it. They perish because they would not be saved. They disbelieved the ruin and despised the remedy. Should we not at this crisis follow Rome into all her refuges, and reason with her, and try to persuade her victims to flee from the wrath to come? Let us impress on them their guilt, and implore them no longer to tread under foot the Son of God, and count the blood of the covenant an unholy thing, and do despite unto the Spirit of Grace.

He comes also "to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all that believe;"—glorified and honoured as their Ransom, Redeemer, Priest, and King—they the monuments of His love and power, He the object of their adoration and praise; they casting before His feet the crowns they received, and He presenting them to Himself, a glorious Church, without spot or blemish. Such will be the marriage supper of the Lamb—the bridal of heaven and earth—the consummation of a long-promised betrothal—the universal spread of a sunshine which shall bathe heaven and earth with a glory that will not fade, and inaugurate a blessedness that will never ebb away.

He comes also to restore the earth to its Eden blessedness; to convert and gather together the long scattered children of Israel; to fill the wide world with the knowledge of God; to dwell with men and reign from sea to sea; to make all things new, and to eject Satan for ever from the world, and to make Jerusalem the beauty and the glory of the

earth; to raise the holy dead and change the pious living; to reward His servants, and to destroy utterly the Papal Antichrist—whom He will destroy with the brightness of His coming or personal presence.

The Church of Rome in the hour of her pride, and seated on her central throne, is to be destroyed by one last and crushing stroke. The earthquake may be her grave or the volcano furnish the fire in which she shall be utterly "burned with fire." It is when she saith, "I sit a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow," that it is written, "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine, and she shall be utterly burned with fire." (Rev. xviii. 7, 8.) "Consumed"—a process—"by the spirit of the Lord's mouth;"—whom "He will destroy"—a stroke—"by the brightness of His coming,"—literally, "personal appearing." This doom hangs over her. Wasted and spoiled, she has struck her last blow for supremacy by convening an Œcumenical Council. It must be a failure; it will precipitate her ruin, and hasten the descent of all those tremendous retributions which God predicts in His Holy Word.

XV.

BABYLON IS FALLEN.

ROME is the Roman Church—in its action, its fruits, and expression. In this city a secret and subtle and irresistible espionage pervades the whole population. Servants report their employers, children their parents, and wives their husbands at confession. Books require to be licensed. Young men are forbidden to give presents to the young women to whom they have promised marriage under a penalty of imprisonment, according to the decree of the Bishop of Senigaglia.

Beggars are universal and irrepressible. Lotteries with all their worst accompaniments are approved by the priests. Immorality, decay, misery, and disease are the indigenous growth of the city of the Pope. The press is without freedom or truth, and the pulpit without power. For a thousand years it has not been otherwise. Sismondi asserts: "'The sixteenth century was marked by an entire abandonment of all morals, honour, and virtue." A reformation was truly demanded. Steinmetz, in his 'History of the Jesuits,' writes: "In Italy, amidst its splendour of arts and science, and its talk of religion, morals are so corrupt that public shame is utterly lost. Nothing is concealed—nothing disgraces." The religion prolific of their fruits, he says, "was not

Christianity, but a time-serving, sensual, lascivious, and avaricious system formed by the passions and intellect of man."

The fermenting elements of her dissolution are working everywhere in Europe. There is begun a rapidly operative process of consumption and disintegration inherent in a system so adverse to what constitutes the freedom, and is embedded in the conscience of humanity—a system that supersedes the government of God by the despotism of the priest—that places an ecclesiastical corporation in the place of God—that denudes the individual of his responsibility to his Maker, and leaves him a helpless victim in the grasp of the priest—that intercepts the enlightening and regenerating influences of heaven, and calls up from beneath influences, evil, hostile, destructive.

This system depresses always, and denounces on great occasions the Word of God. The Pope takes the place of Deity; the bishops the office of the Apostles; and the people are "taught another gospel, which is not another;" and where the light of revelation should shine and brighten into perfect day, the darkness of tradition and superstition lies broad and deep.

The Pope may be a bad man, but this neither destroys nor dilutes his infallibility or indefectibility of faith. Cardinal Hosius (vol. i. p. 68. Colon. 1684), writes: "God will never have thee consider whether the Pope be a Judas, a Peter, or a Paul; it is sufficient that he sits in St. Peter's chair."

This is a terrible defence of papal infallibility; but history proves it is inevitable. Baronius, Dupin, and Paul Sarpi among historians, and Petrarch and Dante among poets, attach so fearful immorality to the Popes of Rome, that nothing short of the statement of Hosius remains to induce anyone to repose any confidence in the infallibility of Popes.

Lord Macaulay, describing the works of Machiavelli, thus writes: "It is indeed scarcely possible for any person not well acquainted with the history and literature of Italy to read without horror and amazement the celebrated treatise which has brought so much obloquy on the name of Machiavelli. Such a display of wickedness—naked, yet not ashamed—such cool, judicious, scientific atrocity, seem rather to belong to a fiend than to the most depraved of men. Principles which the most hardened ruffian would scarcely hint to his most trusted accomplice, or avow, without the disguise of some palliating sophism, even to his own mind, are professed without the slightest circumlocution, and assumed as the fundamental axioms of all political science."

The historian, after much research and reflection, comes to the conclusion that the morality of Italy had so degenerated, and become so debased, that Machiavelli had no idea or suspicion that there was anything objectionable or censurable in his country.

Macaulay writes: "There is no reason whatever to think that those amongst whom he lived saw anything shocking or incongruous in his writings. Abundant proofs remain of the high estimation in which both his works and his person were held by the most respectable among his contemporaries. Clement VII. patronised the publication of those very books which the Council of Trent in the following generation pronounced unfit for the perusal of Christians. Some members of the democratical party censured the secretary for dedicating the Prince to a patron who bore the unpopular name of Medici; but to those immoral doctrines which have since called forth such severe reprehensions no exception appears to have been taken. The cry against them was first raised beyond the Alps, and seems to have

been heard with amazement in Italy. The earliest assailant, as far as we are aware, was a countryman of ours, Cardinal Pole. The author of the Anti-Machiavelli was a French Protestant."

Such a system of religion, creative of so low a moral sentiment as that indicated in the pages of the historian, must, if God reigns and rules, hold in solution the elements of its own destruction.

We do not wonder that Pius IX. infallibly decides in his Syllabus that liberty of conscience, liberty of worship, and the freedom of the press are "erroneous, hurtful, and delirious raving, and the liberty of perdition;" that the salvation of non-Catholics is not even to be hoped for, and that "Bible Societies are pests."

These are the decisions of infallibility, and hints of what society must be in proportion as it becomes saturated with the teaching and influence of the Church of Rome. The 'Spectator,' an able, but not over-religious paper, thus writes:—

"One of the most marked signs of the times in Catholic countries is the extent to which *irreligion* is becoming a religion, a *fanaticism* as fierce and as propagandist as that of any creed has ever been.

"On the Continent the new attitude of Catholicism, its fiercely aggressive obscurantist and persecuting tone, has irritated scepticism to passion, to a hatred of Catholicism and its ministers which in its ferocity and the concreteness of its manifestations recalls the days of the first French Revolution. The laughing scepticism of 'polite society' is vanishing away, and in its place we have a propagandist spirit which cannot be content without overt acts. Men write, it is reported, from all parts of France to congratulate M. de Sainte Beuve—most brilliant among essayists and among the few remaining masters of the lost art of conversation—to congratulate

him on maintaining the 'sacred cause' of Materialism in the Senate, and one such corresponding signs himself a member 'of the grand diocese,' thus making denial of not only a creed, but an ecclesiastical organization. Others, said to be thousands in number, bind themselves by oath never to accept the services of the Church in life, in death, or after death; to be married by civil ceremonial, to reject the 'last offices'—which in Catholic countries have a social as well as religious importance,—and to be buried in unconsecrated ground. Our readers remember the astounding explosion of Materialism among the students from all parts of the world who assembled at Liége to advertise their scorn and hatred of the ideas involved in the words 'God,' and 'soul,' and 'revelation,' and 'Church,' a scorn and hate to which words seemed inadequate to give expression except in phrases that smelt of blood. In Belgium, where Ultramontanism has selected its battle-ground, Materialism, utter and propagandist, is the creed of all but the religious, and is accompanied by a desire not merely to quit, but to put down the Church as an evil thing—a foe to human society. *The struggle is regarded as one between Civilisation and the Syllabus*—as a warfare between irreconcilable ideas, in which every weapon is to be welcomed and quarter is disgrateful. M. de Montalembert, who, if a bigot, is furthest of mankind from a fool, declares publicly his *belief that Paganism is winning, that the Continent is on the eve of a burst of irreligion, or hatred to religion, such as even the Revolution did not produce*, in which all institutions claiming to be Divine will be overthrown, and men commence the organization of a new and secularist world. So terrified are many thoughtful men at the prospect that Protestant statesmen like Guizot sway towards Catholicism as the only visible buttress against the wave,

and—most significant sign of all—fervent Catholics hesitate to proscribe Renan.

"We have often reminded our readers of the fact that a city riot in Belgium always includes an attack on priests and monasteries, and the curious state of affairs in the Department of Charente is a present illustration of the state of feeling. The priests there are being protected by Lancers from the hands of their flocks, who, were the soldiers withdrawn, would tear them in pieces. The Prefect's idea is that the people are passing through one of those paroxysms of credulity which occasionally seize whole nations—witness the witchcraft mania in so many countries—that they are deluded with a report that tithes are to be re-established. That may be the fact, probably is; but wild outbursts of that sort always embody some latent sentiment, some deeply-rooted fear. The man who wants to kill his pastor—be it remembered, an indispensable pastor under the Roman system—because the pastor may by possibility be going to tax him, who resists troops in his thirst for his curé's blood, is not in love with the priesthood. During the sixteen years of the Empire, the Ultramontane yoke has been pressed as sharply down as that of every other form of authority, and without disparaging, far less denying, the theory that France has in places become more religious, we cannot but doubt whether there is not also a genuine hatred of priests as meddlesome officials of the arbitrary sort, or, as the peasants themselves phrase it, with moustaches sharply drawn up under the nose, as the 'black gendarmerie.' . . . . . .

"Naturally, the intellectual Catholics and the laity refuse, being *unable* to deny what they see—that civilisation is good; and the Church is really reduced to what its enemies call it, a corporation hostile to society, and as such, in the judgment of

those enemies, to be *écrasée*, razed off the ground it cumbers. The Church offers in Catholic Europe only the alternatives of abject obedience or hostility, and Europe, unable to obey without discretion, accepts the alternative. It is not with pleasure but with pain that we record a growing doubt whether M. de Montalembert is not in the right, whether, if Rome does not change her policy, Europe may not see an explosion of irreligion, or fanatical hatred to religion of every kind, false and true alike, which will make the last quarter of this century the darkest through which modern man has passed. We like not Catholicism with its sacerdotal claims, or Ultramontanism with its machine-like obedience; but either is better, Hindooism is better, we had almost written Fetichism is better, than the foul creed Papal madness is establishing, the creed which has for solitary profession the dogma, 'Sugar is sweet.'"

In reference to the Luther Memorial Inaugural Celebration at Worms, another journal observes:—"Let the Catholic world bear witness to the results of excommunication, and ask itself whether the better portion of the world is in the hands of those states and nations which still acknowledge the supremacy of the Pope, or of those which have accepted and developed the doctrines of Luther. Analyse the so-called Catholic world, and what do we find? In Italy, Pagans or Atheists. In France, a fashionable superstition in 'high society;' a peasantry shouting 'Down with the priest;' and a nation who are indifferently content to be baptized, married, and buried by the Church on condition of believing in the Revolution and Voltaire. No, in spite of some illusive symptoms of an impossible revival, in spite of solemn 'Anglo-Catholic' dilettanti and ecclesiastical fops, who will certainly never produce a counterpart to the Reformer they so consistently

abominate—whether we look to the most powerful communities in the old world or in the new, the Catholic world must confess that it is Luther "that has conquered, and not the Church or 'the Empire.'"

The Papacy has challenged the civil power in every nation to battle. It puts forth the extremest Ultramontane pretensions—demands of Cæsar submission, and denounces excommunication on all who refuse; and, what is sufficiently menacing, instructs the subjects of every crown that the teacher of these dogmas is infallible, and can punish the soul and body of all recusants in hell. Let it not be forgotten that every Roman Catholic is bound to receive this teaching, inculcated on the masses of the Romish Church in Europe. Resisted in self-defence by the "powers that be," it will inaugurate a European revolution unprecedented for a hundred years. It is the Pope's last stroke for supremacy. It is the nations' last chance of autonomy. What is to be the issue? A short triumph for Rome, succeeded by an overthrow crushing and overwhelming. Prophecy indicates that an hour comes when she will boast "I sit as a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow;" and immediately after we read what will follow her boasting. "Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourning, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her." "And a mighty angel took up a stone like a great millstone and cast it into the sea, saying, Thus with violence shall that great city Babylon be thrown down, and shall be found no more at all."

In every nation in Europe the conscience of humanity is rising in insurrection against Rome, and what in a few instances looks like exception is

merely the expiring struggle of despotism to retain as an ally a religion that offers in exchange support.

The 'Westminster Gazette,' one of the organs of the Papacy in London, thus writes: "All Catholic nations are falling. As nations they have deserted the principles of Catholicism, and they perish by the revolution. Catholic nations changed their front in the face of an enemy, and have been outflanked. They have all endorsed the idea or principle which constituted their highest unity—which gave strength or purpose to national life—to play with the revolution—to act the part of a go-between in the conflict. But these nations have lost the strength of Catholicism without identifying themselves with the revolution. This is how we account for the present state of the Catholic nations. This is why we look with apprehension at the future."

In less than twelve months the Papacy lost the control of three great kingdoms.

Wherever the Pope casts his eye he sees constituted governments falling away from him.

Austria has torn into shreds the Concordat—permitted education with the Bible in the school instead of the priest—given liberty to Protestant pastors to celebrate the marriage of their own people—and made priests like other subjects amenable to civil law.

This has occurred in a country that was the last crutch of the Papacy, and was called the dungeon of Europe.

Twenty years ago the extremest Romish countries in Europe were Italy, Austria, Spain, and Bavaria.

In 1861 Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the States of the Church dismissed their princes and accepted the sovereignty of Victor Emmanuel, and have given freedom to Protestant worship among their people.

In 1866 Austria and Bavaria were struck down by the Prussian Protestant armies, and are transformed from what they were.

In 1868 Spain, the most superstitious, bigoted, and intolerant nation of Europe, dismissed its queen, and now Protestantism has started to its feet, and celebrates its worship in almost every city of the peninsula.

In 1868 the Pope in a Bull of indiction summons the prelates of Christendom belonging to his rule, and apologises for not summoning kings by proclaiming that "there are no longer any Catholic crowns in Europe."

The French paper called 'L'Univers,' edited by M. Veuillot, thus comments on the fact: "The Bull does not invite sovereigns to sit in the Council. The omission is remarkable. It implies that there are no longer Catholic crowns—that is to say, that the order in which society has existed for the last thousand years is now terminated. What we have been used to call the 'middle age' has come to an end. The date of this Bull is the date of its death. Another era now commences. The Church and the State are separated."

Bishop Wordsworth lately said to his clergy from the cathedral pulpit: "I earnestly crave the advice of all and the prayers of all. Do not deny me your indulgence, do not withhold from me your forbearance; give me your love. The times in which we live show that we need unity. If we are divided we must fall. If we are united, by God's help we shall stand. It needs no prophetic spirit to foretell that times of great trial await not only the Church of England, but the whole of Christendom. If we look abroad to the Continent of Europe, we see it arrayed in two hostile camps, each antagonistic to the other, and to Christianity. On the

one side we see a bold infidelity elated with new hopes, inspired with fresh confidence, proudly anticipating victory, and presumptuously sanguine of success. On the other side, we see the Church of Rome estranging the intellect of Europe from Christianity by putting forth novel dogmas and by usurping new powers; and perhaps the present year may not come to a close before she has ascribed to the Roman Pontiff the Divine prerogative of personal infallibility. Thus, by a violent recoil, the intelligence of Europe is going back from the faith of Christ, and, being repelled from communion with Rome, is in danger of falling into a gulf of unbelief; and civil anarchy and confusion must inevitably be the result."

Whatever be the progress of Romanism in England, it cannot be doubted that over the whole area of continental Europe there exist and increase a restlessness and discontent under the tiara such as have not been felt or at least expressed during many years. The States of the Church have been detached. Spain and Austria and Italy are lost to the Papacy, and internal disputes threaten to rend the Romish fabric in pieces. In all directions the Papal power wastes away. The recent great efforts made by the Romish priesthood over the world are the spasms of a dying system, and in no sense or degree the triumphs of an indomitable force. She seems to feel that the day of her greatness has closed—that the "waters on which she sits" ebb rapidly away, and that the power that convulsed a continent, or struck down a dynasty, or dictated laws to emperor and king and cabinet has parted from her and for ever.

The liberated nations already seem to cry, "How hath oppression ceased! the golden city ceased! He who smote the people in wrath, he that ruled

the nations in anger, is persecuted, and none hindereth. Art thou become weak as we? Art thou become like unto us? How art thou fallen from heaven, O Lucifer, son of the morning! How art thou cut down to the ground which didst weaken the nations! Thou hast said in thine heart, I will ascend unto heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I will be like the Most High. Yet thou shalt be brought down to hell, to the sides of the pit. They that see thee shall narrowly look upon thee and consider thee, saying, 'Is this the man that made the earth tremble, that did shake kingdoms?'"

Nor is this the only graphic description of the tyranny, pretensions, and doom of the antichristian power. In another prophecy we read:

"After these things I saw another angel come down from heaven, having great power, and the earth was lighted with his glory, and he cried mightily, 'Babylon the Great is fallen, is fallen, and is become the habitation of devils and the hold of every foul spirit and a cage of every unclean and hateful bird; for all nations have drunk of the wine of the wrath of her idolatry, and the kings of the earth have committed fornication with her, and the merchants of the earth are waxed rich through the abundance of her delicacies.' And I heard another voice from heaven saying, 'Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins and that ye receive not of her plagues. For her sins have reached unto heaven, and God hath remembered her iniquities.'"

How much she hath glorified herself and lived deliciously, so much torment and sorrow give her; for she saith in her heart, "I sit as a queen, and am no widow, and shall see no sorrow. Therefore shall her plagues come in one day, death, and mourn-

ing, and famine; and she shall be utterly burned with fire: for strong is the Lord God who judgeth her."

Her loftiest arrogance precedes her final destruction. She goes down to irretrievable ruin boasting as she descends, as if hers were still the power of Hildebrand and Innocent and Pius VII.

The wasting fever that now burns in her vitals will end in the terrible destruction which closes her existence in the world, and leaves free and accessible to the Gospel that large area of the earth on which Rome has so long lain an incubus and a curse. Her decrees, canons, censures, curses—her intolerance, immorality, idolatry, and mariolatry constitute so grave and so flagrant crimes in the sight of heaven that if analogy and history and prophecy and providence contain any preintimations of the future or indicate any retributions for the past, her doom must be imminent and her judgments gathering as storm-clouds above her, or famine and hunger and death and burning beneath her feet.

The Pope will find it out one day, and sooner than he thinks, that, contrary to his reading, Heaven is stronger than he.

Cardinal Cullen a very few years ago thus attests the consumption that goes on: "The spirit of revolution has destroyed the power of Catholic States. There is no friendly power now capable of supporting the Head of the Church or of maintaining the doctrines and practices of our holy religion. Nearly everything has been taken from the Pope. The Emperor of the French held the hands of the Pope whilst his enemies were stripping him of the patrimony of St. Peter."

The 'Times' writes: "Rome is not only dead—it is eternally decaying."

The descriptions at Rome during the sitting of the

Council contained in the correspondence of the press indicates the increasing consumption and no less significantly points to what prophecy pronounces the approach of her final destruction. Her censures — Latæ Sententiæ —whether reserved to Pope or prelate, or, still more terrible, not reserved at all, excite no terror. On the contrary, they are freely handled in the press, referred to by Roman Catholics with contempt, and regarded by Protestants as wonderful collections of the firewood, driftwood, and *débris* of mediæval days restamped and circulated in bundles by the aged priest who lightens his dotage by such resuscitated labours in his vacant hours.

THE END.

LONDON: PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS,
STAMFORD STREET AND CHARING CROSS.

00110835

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 26 June, 2018